NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXV.

AUGUST, 1900.

AMERICA'S DUTY IN CHINA.

BY JOHN BARRETT, FORMERLY UNITED STATES MINISTER TO SIAM.

CHRISTENDOM is staggered by the crisis in China. But America's duty is definite; her path is plain.

The world's policy in Cathay is the commanding question of the hour. It overshadows national controversies regarding imperialism and the coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one. It is the paramount issue in an international campaign to conserve the world-quickening forces of Christianity, Civilization and Commerce.

Therefore, every American, even in this sultry mid-summer month, whether leisurely resting in cool resorts or laboriously earning his daily bread in city or country, should study well the part America must play on this new stage of international action.

In Asia, America and the world are face to face with an unparalleled and unprecedented situation; but America's policy will be the allied world's policy, if America acts on the strength of her unique position and does not shirk the impending task.

We see the United States unexpectedly summoned to meet in China graver moral responsibilities than it has ever confronted in the Philippines. Likewise, it is challenged by greater material

Copyright, 1900, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opportunities than it will ever discover in all the other undeveloped portions of the world.

In this hour of peril and through trials that shall follow, we must remember that we are a Christian as well as a commercial nation. We are a moral as well as a material force. We are a civilizing as well as an exploiting agency. This is a supreme test in the competition of nations, in a struggle where the principle of the survival of the fittest has its stern and cruel application. Possibly now, as China and the allied nations of the world are in deadly struggle in North China, whether with riotous hordes or government forces, our Anglo-Saxon race, our Anglo-Saxon religions, our Anglo-Saxon systems of society and government are at stake. We cannot, therefore, quail before our responsibility. There is no question of imperialism or expansion involved other than that of the salvation and extension of our race and our institutions.

I do not mean that the United States shall go out of its way to assume responsibilities, to arrogate to itself leadership, to take ostentatiously upon its shoulders the burdens of the world. Rather shall it simply perform its plain duty, as an officer in battle, who, standing in a central, commanding strategic position, holds the fate of his regiment in his hands and determines victory by combining discretion with heroism.

I. AMERICA'S POSITION AND POLICY.

Through all the confusion of the present and the mystery of the future, there stand out these dominant considerations:

First, America is the logical arbiter of China's future; the fate of the Empire depends upon the favor of the Republic;

Second, if there is a Yellow Peril threatening the White World, America, more than any other Power, can lead the way to rendering it colorless and innocuous; because,

Third, America is the only nation present in China to-day, with force and with prominent interests, rights, and commerce, which has the unqualified confidence and trust of the European nations, Japan and China alike, or is not the object of long-standing jealousy and distrust; and,

Fourth, an International Congress or Conference, in which America for the three reasons just given should occupy a prominent and possibly the leading part, will, in the nature of events, be assembled in the near future, to consider what shall be the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attitude and policy of the nations of the world, not only in coping with the great problems of the re-establishment of order, the rehabilitation of the Government, the award of punishment and indemnities, but in determining the future status of China's government and territory and their relation to the outer world.

With this responsibility and position, what shall America's policy include? There should be no equivocation as to the principles involved. Expressed briefly, the main planks in our Chinese platform might be stated as follows:

1. The United States desires and should take no port, province or part of China, either as a sphere of temporary influence or as an area of actual sovereignty.

2. The United States should oppose, with all its moral, political and diplomatic influence, any partition of China among the foreign Powers, or any delimitation of acknowledged spheres of influence.

3. The United States should insist upon the permanent maintenance of the trade principle of the Open Door; as outlined in the present Chinese treaties, throughout all China, by all the Powers endeavoring to exercise influence within her limits.

4. The United States, provided the dissolution of the Empire is inevitable, despite our best efforts of diplomacy and moral suasion, should insist upon the guarantee, by formal convention, of the Open Door principle in all the various areas of foreign sovereignty in China, and will carefully guard against excuses for discriminating duties, national rebates or subsidies, and special freight charges—for the consuming powers of an increasing population of four hundred millions of people and the material development of four millions of square miles are involved.

5. The United States, acting with charity and equity, and in no spirit of vengeance, should employ all its moral and material influence in prescribing just punishment and indemnity for loss of life and property sustained at the hands of fanatical and insurrectionary mobs; in adjusting the true moral responsibility of the overwhelmed government; in establishing permanent order and honest progressive administration of government throughout the Empire; in safeguarding, both for the present and the future, the lives, rights and holdings of missionaries, merchants and other foreign residents; and, finally, in so preparing the way for peace, order and prosperity, to be followed by liberty, justice and free-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dom under the guiding direction of Christian civilization, that we shall win the lasting gratitude of the countless blameless Chinese and make them forever our disciples in moral and material progress.

With the future of China there are concerned four great European factors: Russia, England, Germany and France; two Asiatic, China herself, and Japan; one American, the United States. In such a combination jealousies, distrust and bickerings may clog the way to a satisfactory solution of the great problem. For instance, which one of the first four would the other three select and follow? They could unite on none, and yet all are most friendly to the United States and always willing to listen to its representations. Again, what non-Asiatic Power would China and Japan alike trust? Only America. This was confirmed by their attitude toward America in their late war. Toward what country has China the most friendly feeling? Without doubt, America. For a long time she has recognized us as the only country desiring none of her territory, and wishing to maintain only and always the most amicable relations with her. Even the Chinese Exclusion Act has cut little figure in Chinese-American relations, for its operation has been felt only by a small portion of Chinese in the southern part of the Empire. My theory is simply that the United States is the one nation, from its remarkable strength of position, that can exercise the vigorous moral influence and leadership in the coming negotiations of the Powers, which will assure the settlement of the present crisis, first, with strict justice and honor to all nations concerned, and, second, with no selfish scramble for territory that will lead to the violent break-up of the Empire and the ultimate shutting of the Open Door.

To some, in describing America's prominence and in emphasizing the importance of the crisis, my words may seem those of enthusiasm or exaggeration. Some years' diplomatic experience in Asia may make me speak feelingly, but not rashly and incorrectly. Conditions, not imagination, inspire my conclusions.

II. THE OPEN DOOR AND PARTITION.

Expressed plainly, America has everything to lose and nothing to gain by a divided China; equally true is it that America has everything to gain and nothing to lose by an undivided China.

With China actually partitioned among the foreign Powers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or nominally divided into spheres of influence, we can still have the Open Door. It will exist, however, with the ever-present possibility that actual sovereignty would eventually close the door through discriminations or rebates in duties or freights. Possession, moreover, is nine-tenths of the law, and agreements made in troublous times of Chinese sovereignty may not be held always sacred in times of European sovereignty, especially if new international complications shall develop.

America's chief market in China is now found in Manchuria and in the provinces inclosing the Gulf of Pechili, the scene of the present revolution. Throughout this area we have so far had the Open Door and been able to sell our manufactured cotton goods in successful competition with the rest of the world. We have developed our sales of cotton textiles from $1,600,000 to over $10,000,000 in the last ten years. If the Open Door is maintained, we shall build up this trade tenfold or more. On the other hand, if Russia, Germany or some other Power assume sovereignty, there is the imminent possibility of the cotton manufacturers of those countries demanding preferential railway or steamer rates, which will annul the force of any agreements. They may even demand of their respective governments that these agreements shall be cancelled. This would not be done without protest and difficulty, but when the first international complication arose, or when, for instance, retaliation in trade relations might be necessary, there would be a change of tariffs and duties that might shut out the American product.

Here the Southern States have vast concern. The new industrial prosperity of Dixie has its opportunity largely in supplying manufactured cotton goods to China. The closing of that field of consumption permanently would bring widespread depression to the South.

This is only one illustration. The same story might be true of a French sphere in Kwang-tung, Kwang-se and Yun-nan; of a Japanese sphere in Fuh-keen; of an Italian sphere in Che-keang; of a German sphere in Shan-tung, although we must give these countries credit for assurances that they will follow the policy of the Open Door.

Great Britain has gone so strongly on record as favoring the Open Door, and has so faithfully proved the honesty of her intentions by her policy in her dependencies, that we need have little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worry about the future of the great Yangtsze Valley. Unfortunately, however, our interests and opportunities there are not so large as in the sections which might go to countries that have not proved their good faith through both preachings and practice during an extensive period of years.

While describing the possible dangers of a partition of China, let us be fair and give due credit to other countries. Let us not forget that in the Russian territory of Eastern Siberia and in Manchuria, where Russia now is apparently evolving a sphere of influence, American trade is rapidly developing, and that there is a vast field there for legitimate exploitation. If the conventions which Russia, Germany and France have signed with China, in regard to certain ports and parts of the Empire, include terms which would seem to be in violation of the spirit and letter of our treaties with China in the matter of the Open Door and equal privileges and rights, there has not yet been any test case of importance to prove that there is discrimination against us.

Great Britain has been the pioneer in the Open Door movement, but only two years ago she was appealing in vain to us for co-operation to prevent alienation of territory and to protect trade rights. Lord Charles Beresford forewarned us of present events, but excited no interest beyond a cordial reception. With the hope of stirring up political passion, certain demagogues denounce any possible sympathy of the United States with England in the latter's Chinese policy. This is done in face of the fact that, wherever English authority is paramount in Asia, there are order, prosperity and a fair chance for everybody and all nations—unless nature, in the form of famine, brings unrest. In Hong Kong, England has demonstrated how successfully she can lead the Chinese to their and her advantage.

Russia has worked mighty changes in Eastern Siberia. She generally has extended to America a welcoming hand in commerce. She announces Dalny, formerly Talienwan, as a free port and gateway to Manchuria. Germany proclaims that there will be no discrimination at Ching-taou, or Kiao-chow, against the merchants and ships of other nations.

The masterly diplomacy of Secretary Hay has, furthermore, secured recent assurances, from all the Governments interested in China, that American rights will be permanently safeguarded. If the Powers are sincere, we can be hopeful of the future, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the treachery of international complications often renders meaningless diplomatic notes exchanged in a friendly hour.

If, by the inevitable force of world-events, China is to be despoiled of her territory, then let this same diplomacy of John Hay, or his successor, obtain from every nation securing sovereignty over a part of the Empire a lasting agreement, in unqualified terms, that America shall have in perpetuity the same rights of trade therein as are granted not only to the most favored nation, but to the sovereign power itself. Let this agreement not be confined to a diplomatic note, nor to an exchange of intentions with happy felicitation, but let it be a binding convention, formally signed and sealed.

In this connection, there occurs this vital consideration: In all reasonable probability there is not a Power that will refuse to be a party to such a treaty, if America firmly presses the point to consummation. There is also the cardinal thought in this whole question, that stands out like a beacon light: No power will insist to the limit of force upon the division of China, if America protests with all its moral resources against division.

III. THE GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE.

In this world-crisis, where races, religions, institutions are at stake, America's policy in China should be supported by Democrats and Republicans alike.

The partisan plea that President McKinley's unremitting efforts to protect American life and property in China may lead us into war with some European Power is not well founded. There is little probability of our being embroiled, either in a single-handed or in an international war, if we follow our definite duty in the plain path before us, and do not shrink from the unavoidable moral responsibilities which are imposed upon us as a Christian nation, having vast interests at stake. We can afford to do our allotted work in China because our moral strength is admitted, and our moral and material interests demand it.

We shall need, as we are now exercising, broad diplomacy in adjusting to a nicety the Chinese situation. We are fortunate in the past achievements of the State Department; we, therefore, have confidence for the future. President McKinley, Secretary Hay, and their subordinates, have already won the confidence of the European Powers and Japan, and the lasting gratitude of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China, in the policies they have promulgated previous to the present revolution.

Since the first cry of distress and warning of disaster came from Peking, the Government has left no stone unturned to rescue the lives of our Minister and his family at Peking, and of missionaries and merchants in the same disturbed locality. Immediately following Mr. Conger's request for marines, they were dispatched with all haste to the capital. Then followed, as the danger of the situation developed, an unremitting endeavor to send reinforcements. All that were available were forwarded. The unfortunate contingencies of a typhoon in Manila Bay, the necessity of not weakening materially the force in the Philippines, the difficulties of approach to Tientsin and Peking, the distance of Taku from Manila and from the United States, cannot be set down at the door of the Administration. A careful survey of everything done since notification came to Washington from the only authoritative source, the legation at Peking, will show that the President cannot be held responsible for the reported disaster to foreigners at the capital.

We cannot blame the American residents of Shanghai, in their earnest desire for the protection of American lives and commerce, for using urgent terms in appealing to the Government to do everything in its power in this difficult situation, but if the Government has met that responsibility to the best of its ability, its efforts should be justly appreciated.

It must be remembered, moreover, while public sentiment is so deeply stirred, that every other Government, if there is blame, is as deeply involved in it as the United States. If Russia, with her force at Port Arthur, Great Britain at Wei-hai-wei, Germany at Ching-taou, and Japan with her unlimited resources near at hand, could not rescue their envoys, why should Americans suggest that the President could have saved the Minister of the United States? It must not be forgotten, also, that the foreign representatives themselves at Peking were, in a measure, responsible for the inability of their respective countries to rescue them. Had they made appeals for force earlier, these would have been honored. No request of Minister Conger, in this respect, has ever been pigeon-holed or disregarded by the State Department.

May I not here suggest that our possession of the Philippines —which the anti-imperialists so strenuously oppose as criminal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aggression, but which others, who spent long years in Asia and were in the Philippines during the development of the present situation, honestly believe are ours simply as a result of our courageously meeting unavoidable moral responsibilities, complicated by an insurrection inspired by ambitious leaders and the enemies of the United States—has enabled us to cope with the present Chinese situation in time, manner and force which would not have been possible without our presence there. Despite the failure of the allied troops to reach Peking in time, our record has been to our credit, pride and honor in the competition with other nations. Under other conditions, we would have been entirely dependent upon other Powers, and possibly treated by them with patronizing kindness or negative indifference. Our soldiers have been in the front lines of attack and defense, and we have done our part as a first-class Power in the presence of overwhelming responsibilities.

But if there is any doubt in the minds of some men about our policy in China, let there be no misunderstanding about territorial aggrandizement. Once and for all, we want no part of China; we will take no part of China; we demand only the Open Door and protection for the lives of our representatives, missionaries and merchants, under conditions of reform and progressive government.

Even visions of coaling stations and a northern rendezvous for our Philippine naval squadron must not tempt us at this hour into an equivocal position on this vital consideration. If we should weaken one jot or tittle, our influence in Asia would lose its healthy force. The confidence of Europe, the trust of Japan and the respect of China would then be forfeited. Nothing could save the integrity of the Empire, and the hinges of the Open Door would be oiled for the closing.

IV. A McKINLEY DOCTRINE IN ASIA.

We have a Monroe Doctrine in America; shall we not have a McKinley Doctrine in Asia? This is said in all seriousness and without a suggestion of political bias. No matter how much some men oppose the President's Philippine policy, either in honesty of conviction or in zeal of party fealty, the permanent protection of life and property, the well-being of missionaries and merchants, the vast moral and material interests of the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States, and a high degree of patriotism should inspire them to support his Chinese policy—not only the policy of the moment, but that which he has already initiated in recent negotiations with the Powers.

Shall not the McKinley Doctrine in China mean that America shall stand with all its strength for the permanent maintenance of the Open Door in China—an open door through which the diplomat and the traveller, the missionary and the merchant, the engineer and the educator, shall pass and re-pass forever in safety?

As corollary to the main proposition, shall not the McKinley Doctrine in China mean that America shall stand with all its legitimate moral influence to prevent any Power whatsoever, monarchial or republican, acquiring sovereignty over any extended part of the present unpartitioned area? And, possibly, in the growing power and name of our good land, this use of moral influence, to the full extent of its lengthening tether, may in a peaceable way accomplish as much in Asia, as the use of moral *and* armed force, which the Monroe Doctrine involves, can accomplish in America.

Then, with the Monroe Doctrine shutting out Europe from governmental control of the Americas, and with the McKinley Doctrine opening up the vast markets and material opportunities of Asia to the United States, it may be indeed difficult to determine which doctrine will confer the most direct and lasting benefits on the largest number.

Commerce is the life-blood of nations. The commerce of Asia may yet be needed to give us the strength to conserve the governments and commerce of the Americas. The McKinley Doctrine in the Pacific and China may provide the sinews of war to defend the Monroe Doctrine in the Americas.

V. CHINESE RESPONSIBILITY.

In judging the responsibility of the Chinese people and government for these uprisings and massacres, we must be stern but not vengeful. We must find all of those who are guilty and punish them as they deserve. While the world is not in a mood to forgive the Chinese government for its compromising course with the so-called Boxers, it must remember that this has been a riotous movement, which has developed force and apparent organization as a snowball grows into an avalanche, and over-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whelmed both the government that temporized with it and the foreign forces that strove to check it. If the authorities had crushed it in its inception we would have heard little or nothing of it. Unfortunately for themselves and for the outer world, they let it go on, as sometimes we have even known American officials to do with mobs, until it was beyond control.

There is no question that recent seizures of territory by foreign Powers, particularly those in the Shan-tung and Liao-tung Peninsulas, have had a baneful effect. Moreover, anti-foreign officials in the interior, taking advantage of this foreign invasion and of their personal hatred of the missionaries, have even fostered the publishing of misleading placards about missionaries and other foreigners. They are largely responsible for the internal excitement. The widespread famine prevailing in North China has greatly aided the development of anti-foreign feeling. Lack of rain and failure of crops have been blamed upon the foreigners by Boxer agitators. The Boxers themselves are simply an organized anti-foreign body of men under a new name, who have excited the masses.

In dealing with them the Central Government made the cardinal error of compromising with them, instead of putting them down at first. Even such capable foreign representatives as Minister Wu at Washington, Minister Conger at Peking, and Consul-General Goodnow at Shanghai, did not seem to understand this mob movement and realize its strength until, like a flood started by a cloudburst, it was breaking through all barriers. What was the effect on the masses at a critical moment of bringing marines to Peking, of the capture of the Taku forts, of the reported burning of the Tsung-li-Yamen by German soldiers, of the alleged failure of the envoys to leave Peking when ordered, cannot yet be accurately told, but it would now appear to have added fuel to the flame.

In this connection, it is well to note the strong words of the Americans expressed at their mass meeting at Shanghai on July 18th. Their appeal included this significant conclusion: "The present outrages are the result of the weak and vacillating policy of the Powers in the past."

If the Powers have hesitated in the past, they will be staggered with the work now before them. The reorganization of the Chinese government on lines of modern progress will be a mighty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undertaking, of which the outside world has little conception. China is not lacking in able men; but conservatism, custom and tradition have figured so prominently in all administrations through centuries that radical changes and new methods will not be welcomed, and will be opposed by officials and masses alike.

VI. MISSIONARY AND MATERIAL INTERESTS.

Of the missionaries in China I have much more to say in praise than in censure. I do not sympathize with the superficial criticism often found in the treaty ports and expressed by passing travellers against them. They are doing far more good than harm. For years it was my privilege to study carefully their work in Siam, where over one hundred were under my jurisdiction; and in frequent visits to China I noted the methods and results of their labors there.

The sum and substance of the anti-missionary sentiment among the ignorant Chinese is this: the corrupt local officials are opposed to the missionaries, because the Chinese who are taught or converted by them know what is just and right, and demand it. Perhaps the matter goes up to the Viceroy for complaint through the Taotai or Consul and back again. This makes trouble for the official, and causes him in revenge to wink at anti-foreign agitation and the publication of malicious posters. When we withdraw our missionaries from Asia, then let us withdraw our ministers and merchants. The missionary interests of the world in China are too vast, too widely ramified and too deeply rooted for any foreign government to suggest that they shall be withdrawn from China. Then above all is the supreme consideration that the forces of Christianity which have been struggling for centuries in Asia cannot consider now for a moment the possibility of retreat and defeat.

Many may honestly differ with me in my opinion of missionary work, but I cling to the faith of our fathers, confirmed by long experience and observation in Asiatic city and jungle.

What has the world materially at stake in China? What has America at stake there? These questions are frequently proposed by those who, in the rush of other matters, have not heretofore studied China. In former contributions to the REVIEW I have endeavored to point them out. Though summarized briefly, some of those which are important and suggestive of wide possi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bilities are here noted. China, with 400,000,000 people, in 4,000,000 square miles, has only 400 miles of railway, but needs in the near future 40,000 miles. Her foreign trade is $333,000,000 per annum, an increase of one hundred per cent. in ten years. America's share, including Hong Kong, is $43,000,000, or one-eighth, in the mere infancy of its development. China's *per capita* trade, with greater potential resources than Japan, is less than one dollar, against Japan's six dollars. Apply the latter's ratio to China's population and we have the magnificent possibility of $2,400,000,000. There are mighty waterways, rivers and canals to be improved, dredged and bridged; coal, iron, gold, copper, tin and silver mines to be developed; numberless cities to be provided with waterworks, sewerage systems, electric lights and street railways; telegraphs and telephones to be extended; roads to be built, and countless increasing millions supplied with food, clothes and other growing wants of peoples coming into contact with the outer world.

In the face of these immeasurable opportunities, the improvement of which will bring vast benefits to capital and labor in America, who is willing to suggest that we shall retreat and leave China to the control of European nations?

In conclusion, I may be pardoned for quoting the final words of an address which I had the honor to deliver before the Shanghai General Chamber of Commerce on the 12th of January, 1899: "I beg of you, in judging America's policy in the Far East, to remember that these closing days of the nineteenth century are times that try men's souls, when all nations are unsettled in policy and uncertain as to what the future will bring forth. There is confusion in the minds of the people and doubt in the thoughts of statesmen. The United States has its share of trial and tribulation. But there will soon be an end to it all, when the sunshine of peace and certainty must break through the dark clouds of politics. Let us hope that this day may soon come and bring with it such decision as will promote the comity, prosperity and well-being of all nations, American, European and Asiatic."

JOHN BARRETT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE RULERS FOR THE DISTURBANCES IN CHINA.

BY LIEUTENANT CARLYON BELLAIRS, R. N.

CHINA is the land of contradictions, where the unexpected happens simply because its underlying paradox is the contrast between reality and appearance. It is true that there is a huge agricultural population, which for straightforwardness in many respects will compare favorably with any similar population in the world. The profound indifference, however, of this class to all outside questions, so long as it is left undisturbed to till the soil, sets it apart altogether from the immediate problems that confront us. Whether it is a matter of diplomacy or business, the Chinaman with whom we have to deal always wears a mask of inert prejudice tempered by suave politeness; so that the longer one is in contact with the race the more one is struck with its immobility.

To peer behind the mask, we must have recourse to statistics and visit British settlements, like Hong Kong, Singapore, and Penang. Then we discover in the Chinaman an active rival, who is almost too progressive for our tastes. Being a born trader, he is gradually monopolizing the land and its business, so that one is not surprised to find that the chief complaint running through the last files of the *China Mail* is that at Hong Kong the European will soon have no room to live. The work of governing, the Chinaman is content to leave to the British. The administration goes on with comparative smoothness, just as was the case in the Anglo-French occupation of Canton for nearly four years, from January 5, 1858, to October 21, 1861. All goes well, until the guilds or the mandarins who can influence the people are of opinion that a grievance will pay. The underlying motive is always money, though every side-wind, from superstition to racial prejudice, is enlisted in the winning of it. The fact is that, in lust for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

money, the Jew is not to be compared with the "heathen Chinee." When the latter is not working for money he is amusing himself by gambling for it.

It is much the same with the rulers and *literati* of China As is the case in Turkey, this policy may be hostile to the interests of the people, and it may be the old familiar one of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. The aged mandarins know, however, that man's life is limited, and they are by no means the first to have cried, "After us, the deluge." They have a conviction that a firm footing for the foreigners is only a preliminary to their own eviction, under what has been styled, in European diplomacy, "the Bag and Baggage Policy." Hence, their readiness to alienate territory rather than to open up the country as a whole, and hence much of the success of Russian diplomacy, which has nothing to gain by the opening up of China. The difficulties which a viceroy can throw in the way of trade are for him so many gates, for the passing of which he can exact toll. The mask of ignorance and prejudice is adopted of set purpose, though a mandarin is quite as well able as a director of the Standard Oil Trust to persuade himself that he always acts in the best interests of the people. This policy is so successful that the talk in England has generally been of "the necessity of gentleness in dealing with so ancient a civilization." "We are anxious," said Lord Salisbury, "if possible, that the interference of foreign nations shall be limited to that encouragement of domestic improvements which foreign nations have such enormous powers of giving."* If Lord Salisbury means the sort of encouragement we have been giving during the last four years, launching the Emperor on a path of reform and then leaving him to appeal in vain to Great Britain for support, then truth compels us to state that we might just as well argue with a Chinese lamp on its special function of giving out light.

After the usurpation of all authority by the Dowager Empress we find Germany, France, Italy and Great Britain successively snubbed by China. "The Powers of Europe," says Mr. H. S. Hallett, "either from mutual antagonism or owing to the rapid increase of China's drilled forces and modern armament, were apparently cowed by China's truculent attitude." † That courag-

*"The Times," May 18, 1898 (speech in the House of Lords).
†"The Times," June 25, 1900

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eous attitude it has been the mistaken policy of most Englishmen, like Lord Salisbury and Lord Charles Beresford, to encourage. We have bombarded the Taku forts three times, and still we cannot learn that militarism, at its best a necessary evil, is, in the hands of a reactionary government, prone to rely on shams, the worst evil of all. From a strong, growing nation, like Russia, it is, of course, absurd to exact conditions, as British statesmen attempted to do when they stipulated against the creation of arsenals in the Black Sea. With the Chinese, from whom we ought to have exacted such conditions, we have travelled far in the opposite direction. What we require from the Chinese is a military police, preserving and tending to develop the work of the imperial maritime customs. The Japanese are keen judges of character, and long years ago fathomed the imposture of China. They were right about its military strength, when all Europe was wrong. They have no less surely measured its moral strength. Hence they are accused of being brusque in their dealings with Chinese rulers, and cautioned against the foolish confidence of a nation which revolutionized its policy before it had time to change its dress. Even Lord Charles Beresford, in his "Break-Up of China," finds fault with the British Government on one occasion for pressing a just claim with some harshness. If Lord Charles had been the British representative and sat down to argue the matter out with the different mandarins to whom he would be referred, he would be sitting down to this day. The Chinese proverb that ceremony is the smoke of friendship has its application in the ways of Chinese statesmen.

In all dealings with China, the personal responsibility of the leaders or rulers is the chief thing to bear in mind. To hang them is to outrage civilized sentiment. They can be punished in other ways. They must be brought to understand thoroughly that the old policy will no longer pay them personally. They have in their hands enormous powers. They can chop off heads, as a mere matter of policy, without regard to the innocence of the owners of the heads. They have before now shown that, if they choose to exert their powers, they can do so with effect. They can raise or quell the anti-foreign outbreaks. Disturbances similar to the present were raised before the China-Japan war, but with the outbreak of war the rulers found it convenient to avoid offending European powers, the inflammatory placards and books were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

withdrawn, and the people resumed their former friendly relations with foreigners. The people are turbulent, say the mandarins, well knowing that horrible charges against the missionaries are being circulated with their connivance. The people are very superstitious about spirits wherever a railway is promoted. The reason is self-evident; for, when the mandarins are propitiated or given a due sense of expediency, then the spirits wax propitious, and the people give no thought to the breaking up of railways or the tearing up of telegraph poles. After the massacres of 1891, a British Consul, Mr. Gardner, charged certain mandarins with having inspired the anti-foreign crusade. Sir Halliday Macartney, who is of English birth, but is in the Chinese Legation as a Chinese subject, was able to effectually shield them by the usual Chinese methods. Consequently, they and others are able to repeat their diabolical work in 1895, and again in 1900.

To enable pressure to be applied to China, *The Times* advocates Gordon's policy of shifting the seat of government to some position readily accessible to the maritime or trading Powers, so that the policy of firm persuasion may be exercised at all times. The necessity of this the Japanese clearly appreciate in the light of their own history. Their capital was easily accessible in the days when reaction and reform were at issue. There were similar outbreaks against foreigners in Japan in the sixties of the present century. In 1861 there was a "palace revolution," as the British representative, Sir R. Alcock, termed it in his official dispatch. It was followed, says the dispatch, by the reformers being "driven from their posts into disgrace and exile." There were outbreaks and murders after the Mikado had, in 1862, ordered the Shogun to "expel foreigners." Civil war was imminent all over Japan in 1863 and 1864. In September, 1864, the allied forces of France, Great Britain, the United States and the Netherlands destroyed the batteries of Choshiu, so as to force Japan to reopen the Straits to the Inland Sea. By 1865, the so-called anti-foreign movement was moribund. The concert of the Powers succeeded then, as it succeeded in Crete, through decisive action. The Mikado made the cause of reform his own; and the same process can be repeated in China by the Son of Heaven. The decisive action *must,* however, be successful, as a temporary check involves immense loss of prestige. In Crete we had to apply the "bag and baggage" policy to the Turkish garrison. China can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be no less surely cured of its maladies by depriving the rulers of their opportunities for evil, as has been done in Egypt. There we have set up an *imperium in imperio,* and the same thing, as Mr. Valentine Chirol ably points out,* practically exists to-day in China in the imperial maritime customs established by Prince Kung in 1862. Ruled by Europeans and Americans, it affords a strong contrast with the Chinese Tsung-li-Yamên, or Department of Foreign Affairs, created at the demand of Great Britain and France after the occupation of Peking by the allies in October, 1860. There is not a solitary voice raised to deny the good work done by Sir Robert Hart. This work can be done again in other directions by men like Sir Thomas Jackson, if they put their shoulders to the wheel while in the prime of life and are prevented by wise foresight from spoiling the edifice of their work by remaining beyond their time.

One cannot repeat too often that China is a country that cries aloud for leadership and seldom gets it, where good or evil broadens downward from the rulers to the people. More than any other country, it suffers from the blighting hand of the old man in its administration. In her case, unfortunately, the hand is an avaricious one. Since Confucius taught that old men should be held in an esteem which is almost worship, they are enabled to keep their posts when vigor can no longer be looked for. Old men can be trusted to sit still, and certainly they have succeeded in China. Pascal held that most of the evils of life arise from the inability of man to sit still. The Chinese statesman acts as if he believed that all the evils of life arise from this cause. To encourage him to shut not one eye only, but both eyes, is the aim of Muscovite diplomacy. To worry him with pin pricks appears to be the British ideal. He has now been worried into action, and therein lies the second application of Pascal's saying. Since British statesmen refused to act courageously, the reactionary party under the Empress Dowager has been given enough rope to hang itself. Hitherto the Chinese people, and not the government, have been punished by the Powers, and in such a way that the rulers have ever been able to turn the resentment of the people against the foreigners. So things have gone from bad to worse, while huge trading interests have been built up before even provision had been made for safeguarding them.

*"The Far Eastern Question," V. Chirol.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While deploring the loss of life during the long period of half-measures, we may say that the future outlook is hopeful. The Empress Dowager has hopelessly compromised the present system by open encouragement given to the Boxers, whose motto is to "Uphold the dynasty and drive out the foreigners." This has drawn the arms of the civilized Powers into China. The salvation of China may lie in the strength of an alliance which unites under a motto so opposed to the Boxers' motto, as "Never again." It was a President of the United States who said that to secure the repeal of a bad law it must be enforced. The bad system of Chinese government has been allowed the latitude which has made its evil crop manifest. Not even Li Hung Chang, with the support of Russia, and with all the skill that enables him to address the world on the iniquity of trading in opium, while insiders know that China is stained with his poppy fields, can save the present system of misgovernment, if Great Britain, the United States, Japan and Germany decide that the Bag and Baggage policy must be applied. That is a method which has ever been effectual, whether applied to the Crown of England in the Declaration of Independence, to Spain in her colonies, or by the British Government to the East India Company in India.* On one point let us not deceive ourselves. To talk about the capture of the Taku forts as "impressing the Chinese mind" is, in the light of history, the vainest of vain dreams. Troops can march to Peking and withdraw, and the rulers will save their "face" by announcing to the people that the foreign devils came as vassals to pay tribute. To this day the greater part of China has probably never heard of the war with Japan. The process of impressing the people is a game at which we can always be beaten unless we impress the people through their rulers.

"The only hope," said Lord Salisbury, "for the well-being of the people and for the growth of industry and commerce must be a reform in the government of the Chinese people themselves."† All of us can agree with this, but it was the excess of futility to add "that in the prosecution of this reform they must be protected,

*A parallel can be drawn between the persistence of the Chinese Government in excluding trade and the similar policy pursued by the East India Co. in India at the beginning of the century. The Company was content to raise revenues, and maintained that there were no opportunities for trading. The British Government forced the Company to open the Indian ports, and when the Company had failed in the Indian Mutiny to maintain law and order, it was shorn of its remaining powers.

†"The Times," May 18, 1898 (speech in the House of Lords).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so far as we can protect them, from any external interference." With such a plain intimation of non-intervention, the Peking schemers started reforming according to their own ideas. More than once *The Times*, and its able Peking correspondent, pointed out that a Boxer movement was the probable outcome of the *coup d'etat* by which the Emperor was deposed and the Reform Party driven out of power. It seems incredible that any one could suppose that, having knocked down the chimneys of the structure that they wished to raze to the ground, the reactionary party would be content with their folly like schoolboys at play. The party was in deadly earnest and had merely whetted its appetite.*

That the life of the Emperor was spared may have been due to the spontaneous outbreak of an unusual public opinion, petition after petition being sent to Peking from the younger mandarins and progressive Chinese communities. The crusade against the reformers, however, became more ominous, and it was on June 1st that Sir Claude MacDonald demanded the reason for the impeachment of three Chinamen who were charged with having been concerned in obtaining commercial concessions for foreigners. Then events followed each other with the rapidity we are led to expect only on prepared stages.

Skobeleff's saying with reference to Central Asia is true of China: "The position of affairs changes not every hour, but every minute. Therefore, I say vigilance, vigilance, vigilance." The changes this time were rung so as to shock all the great Powers into a sense of common danger. The story of the Legation guards and Seymour's forlorn hope is known to all. "It is will, decision, and audacity, which succeeds in the East," says the *Spectator*. Will and decision would have taken the lead that belongs of right to the country holding three-fifths of the trade. To withdraw the Ambassador from his humiliating position of making ineffectual protests to a lying court, to have brought Indian troops to Kowloon, and finally to have invited Japan to

*The following extract from Lord Salisbury's famous speech on China, in which he referred to "the dying nations," is interesting in connection with the above. He said: "In them [the dying nations] misgovernment is not only not cured, but is constantly on the increase. The society and official society, the administration, is a mass of corruption, so that there is no firm ground on which any hope of reform or restoration could be based, and in their various degrees they are presenting a terrible picture to the more enlightened portion of the world—a picture which, unfortunately, the increase in the means of our information and communications draws with darker and more conspicuous lineaments in the face of all nations, appealing to their feelings as well as to their interests, calling upon them to bring forward a remedy."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

send 20,000 men into camp at We-Hai-Wei, that would have been evidence of will and decision. To bring affairs to such a pass that we have to send small bodies of men from the fleets, so that they have to depend for their existence on local supplies and are liable to be starved by the mere passive obstruction of the Chinese, that is a form of audacity with which we are unfortunately familiar as leading to the exhaustion of "a dying nation."

Lord Salisbury has declared "that what China wants is courage; and one of my defenses of the occupation of Wei-Hai-Wei is that it has a tendency to strengthen China against despair and to give her courage, if the occasion should arise, *to stand up against* her enemies.* So far as the writer can judge, not one of the dying nations has lacked courage. Indeed, for a period we see China audaciously defying the world in arms, and Lord Salisbury will hardly felicitate himself by attributing the inspiration to our occupation of Wei-Hai-Wei. The country that has conspicuously lacked courage in her treatment of the problem of China has been Great Britain. Lord Salisbury said of his predecessor's conduct of affairs that "he should have doubted the wisdom of this country standing by and seeing Russia and her allies, France and Germany, driving Japan out of the Liao-Tung Peninsula without taking some security that Russia was not doing that with a view to future operations." This criticism is just, but we may well ask what Lord Salisbury did when those future operations came. The story of how the Government authorized the withdrawal of the British ships from Port Arthur in deference to Russia's protest, and how the occupation of Port Arthur and Ta-lien-wan followed, is too well known to need recapitulation. The writer, from personal experience, can answer for our loss of prestige and the humiliated feelings of the British sailors. Why was it done, unless from want of courage? Lord Salisbury himself said after the event that "there was no more effective method of driving them (the Chinese) to despair than allowing Port Arthur to be occupied by the Power which already stands over so enormous a portion of the frontier, and threatens them with so large a conquest."†

*"The Times," May 18, 1898.

†The official representative in the Foreign Office in the House of Commons, Mr. Curzon, said on February 8, 1898, that "the right to send ships of war to Port Arthur is a right which we enjoy together with other Powers under the Treaty of Tientsin, and when the occasion arises we shall do it again." The request of Russia that the two British cruisers should be withdrawn was as cool a piece of impudence as President

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The most noteworthy fact of the present situation is that all the great nations have interfered in China, and can all claim, under the principle of "the stricken field" or the sacrifices that have been made, a voice in the settlement. If the court is at Peking the settlement is close at hand, and an initial victory can be obtained by breaking down the ceremony which surrounds it—that ceremony which is "the smoke of friendship." As regards compensation for losses incurred and punishment of high officials, the Powers may be expected to act more or less in unison. It is when the question of reform is raised that hostile camps are likely to be formed, and delays will be dangerous. We know that an honest government, with some security of tenure and bent on maintaining law and order, is essential to safe trading. Unfortunately, the history of French diplomacy in Morocco and Russian diplomacy in Turkey and Persia, shows that a weak reactionary government may be preferred by nations bent on turning the situation to their own advantage. If, however, the Emperor is alive at Peking, and, under the advice of the reformers and the guarantees of the trading Powers he elects to shift the capital to Nanking, it is difficult to see how Russian influence can checkmate the decision. We must, however, be prepared to deal in no tender spirit with any viceroys fomenting disturbances for the purpose of influencing his decision.

The antagonism between the Powers in this matter must come to light. In an appreciation of Russian diplomacy in this REVIEW for June, a writer says that "the diplomatist develops into perfection and blossoms most in the midst of ignorance, degradation and corruption." Russian agents have free hands and do not show them, though it does not take much study of their methods and that ambiguous proposition, the Russo-Chinese Bank, to conclude that one hand threatens and the other bribes. China as at present circumstanced is a peculiarly favorable field for such methods. To change these deplorable conditions is the instinctive desire of the trading Powers. It can only be done by a more

Krüger's ultimatum, having in view that Port Arthur was a Chinese port. As a naval officer, I know that the foundation of our naval policy is to "shadow" an enemy, the shadowing, being commenced in time of peace with the view of bringing the enemy to action as soon as war breaks out. That policy has necessitated our ships following Russian ships during peace over thousands of miles of water and never losing sight of them. This being our fixed and indispensable naval policy, it was with a feeling of utter despair that we realized that Lord Salisbury had acquiesced in Russia's right to protest against British vessels being at anchor in a neutral port at the same time as her own. The sequel showed the folly of breaking with a well-tried policy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

courageous statesmanship than we have been accustomed to from "the mandarins of Downing street," as *The Times* calls the British Foreign Office. They have hitherto been so nervous of Russian diplomacy that an agreement has never been reached. Much of the antagonism lies in the history of the past, during which the statesmanship of the two countries has worked in a vicious circle. The methods of Russia create universal distrust. On the other hand this distrust induced Great Britain to place herself athwart Russia's vast, civilizing mission in Asia. It is impossible, and it ought not to be possible, to block a nation adding two millions yearly to her population, and with a huge territory in Asia, from access to the sea. These two antagonistic policies have bred each other's increase. We have already instanced the Port Arthur episode. The Russian Minister had prepared Peking for what was to happen. "My master," he said in effect, "is going to order the English out of Port Arthur." "The loss of British prestige," said a high official to the writer, "was terrible."

Korea is another instance of shuffling on both sides. Russia bound herself not to touch Korean territory, but the agreement was a verbal one and with China. This absurdity was reached by Great Britain carrying matters to the very verge of war. The latest Russian move for the lease of over 400 acres in a Korean port sweeps away all doubt as to the scope embraced by her diplomatic net. We can let the matter rest as a war issue until the reformed government is established in China. It will then be time enough to demonstrate to that government the strength of the maritime Powers by a guarantee of Korean territory. If Russian soldiers have been landed, Russia can be invited to withdraw them and to join in the agreement. A refusal must, of course, be followed by their eviction.

Korea is the natural outlet for Japan's expanding population and the future source of her food supply. Japan is under no illusions as to Russia's strength. Some time back the Marquis Ito visited Russia. On his return, a friend of the writer asked him what would happen when Japan and Russia fought. The great man threw out his arms and said with emphasis, "We will walk through them." At that time corruption was known to vitally affect Russia's armed forces, but we had not before us the Black Sea scandals, which brought some fifty or sixty responsible naval officials before a secret court-martial. Apart from this, the Jap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anese count on actual physical superiority. If their officers lack the advantage of a high tradition, they have on the other hand the highest possible sense of personal honor in the service of their country, and the freshness of their army and navy has spared them from that dead weight of conservatism which causes so much that is obsolete to be retained. If Great Britain does not actively assist the Japanese they rely on her to hold back France and to rigidly enforce the treaty provisions which *prevent the Russian Black Sea Fleet from passing through the Dardanelles.* They are under no illusions as to the Siberian railway and its branches, extending to over 5,000 miles. It runs through country where their secret service can work, and where a small bribe can induce men to again and again risk their lives to wreck the railway until such time as they can land their forces. When Russia fights in the Far East it will be on the basis of her Eastern Siberian armies and their accumulated supplies. Including over 30,000 in garrison at Vladivostock, and allowing for railway employees and emigrants with military training, we may estimate these forces at about 150,000 men. The relative proportion of forces makes it probable that Japan will obtain command of the sea. Indeed, apart from the use of a sea base to terrorize China, the feverish defensive preparations at Port Arthur are due to the knowledge that either Japan or Great Britain can sweep the Russian fleet off the sea.* Hence the enormous stores of grain, tinned meats, and bullion which *The Times* correspondent says are being accumulated at Port Arthur, while 90,000 coolies are working on the fortifications. To wage war without success is, however, worse than futile. If, then, Japan can secure her sea communications and strike when she wills with ultimately five army corps in the field, it is difficult to see what Russia can hope for if she does not obey the mandate of the maritime Powers, including Japan.

The fact is Russia aims at achieving her conquests chiefly by peaceful methods. In twelve years' time it is hoped that the Siberian railway will be a double line. The sooner the better. The world is under a debt of obligation for this great feat, which, as a single line, will have cost nearly 400 million dollars. It is with a feeling of profound thankfulness that one reflects how this civilizing work might have been lost, and thirty battleships and

*Such detailed accounts of the forces in the Far East have already been published, that the writer has omitted to set these figures out afresh.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their crews provided in its place, a programme which would have gone far to redress for a time the grave handicap under which Russia must always lie through the want of continuity of her coast line. It is with a feeling of utter dismay that one contemplates this vast industrial work being shattered by war, at a time when Russia sorely needs Anglo-Saxon capital to reap the reward of her labors. It would seem, therefore, that Russia has every inducement to conciliate the rich maritime Powers until such time as it can no longer be said that she has bitten off in Asia "more than she can chew." One cannot conceal, however, the gravity of the coming crisis, if there is any ambiguity in the position of some of the Powers. The Crimean War need never have occurred had Prussia joined with the Franco-English alliance. So there may be war. No greater mistake could be made than to suppose that the British people, disgusted at the practical failure of their expectations in South Africa, will be chary of maintaining a strong policy in China for fear of a war with Russia. The experience of South Africa has given them the idea that India is invulnerable on the land side. They have astonished themselves with the large military forces they have put in the field. They have emerged from the war with an empire welded together, and with a military prestige which they had hitherto lacked. They are conscious that they will not act alone, and are united in support of a strong policy for reasons which can now be stated.

Great Britain's chief concern with foreign nations, said Cobden, is to trade with them. British subjects in all parts of the world attach unusual importance to the China trade. In China, then, "our chief concern" is deeply involved, for in 1899 we had over sixty-three per cent. of the trade, and sixty-one per cent. of the shipping entering the treaty ports. This being so, the Cobden or Manchester school, which has usually opposed a strong policy, will in this case be as deeply moved to support it. Throughout the Far East, the words China and trade are convertible terms with the Anglo-Saxon race. Talk to a Russian about China, and his discourse will be of territory and four thousand miles of frontier. Talk to a Frenchman, and he will tell you of Destiny, of the Divine task of protecting the missionaries (whom he has turned out of his own country), and of the sacrifices France has made in building up Indo-China. The Anglo-Saxon, on the other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hand, tells you he wants trade and he means to get it. But how? Here is a list of the requirements of the situation:

(1.) The breaking down of court etiquette.
(2.) The transfer of the capital to the seaboard.
(3.) Administrative reform.
(4.) *(a)* A Revenue-Board under Europeans or Americans.
(b) A Board of Communications with departments modeled on the plan of the Suez Canal Directorate.
(c) An international tribunal for the settlement of claims against China.
(5.) The complete opening of all ports under the Imperial Maritime Customs.
(6.) The abolition of *likin* or inland duties.
(7.) The right to be conceded to all races to hold property and to carry on business throughout China.
(8.) The acquirement by China, under the Board of Communications, of all railways through its territory.

These requirements mentioned above are goals to be reached, but those who travel along the path of reform know that the start is everything. It was America that commenced the reform movement in Japan by military pressure. By peaceful diplomacy Mr. John Hay obtained the signatures of the nations to that Magna Charta of China, the Open Door Policy, or equal trading rights for all. Now, if there is any truth in the saying that in the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed man is king, then, if lust of territory blinds others to the interests of humanity, America should be able to intervene with great effect. To open up a thickly populated territory, larger than the United States and containing in its soil coal-beds estimated to cover twenty times the area of those of Great Britain, that will be one of the grandest diplomatic triumphs the world has ever seen. The issue is possibly even larger. If the impress of the West on the East is to be Anglo-Saxon, it must be the joint work of the two great branches of the race. And the extent of Anglo-Saxon and Slavonic influence in reconstructed China is to be largely determined in the next three months.

CARLYON BELLAIRS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICA'S SHARE IN A PARTITION OF CHINA.

BY DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER.

In a previous number of this Review,* I ventured to predict that the dissolution of the Chinese Empire was inevitable and not remote. Recent events have not diminished the probability of that disruption; and, however reluctant each Power may be to begin the process, the anti-foreign sentiments of the Chinese masses, not less than the collapse of their Government, will leave no practical alternative. The world will have to prevent anarchy in China, as well as to uphold the common interests of humanity and civilization. After proclaiming to the skies the super-excellence of the Open Door policy, the discovery will be made that the continued existence of a Chinese Empire is not necessary for its application, and that the states of the world can themselves come to a mutual understanding without the intervention of Manchu Emperor or Tsung-li-Yamen, to observe the common fiscal and commercial policy which is illustrated by the phrase of the "open door." The case of Central Africa will be cited to justify the summoning of a conference for the division of spheres, and also for the proclamation of the principles by which the Powers will regulate their conduct and action for the general good. The adoption of this course may come at any moment; on the other hand, it is quite possible that an amelioration of the situation in China may lead to its adjournment. But, whether imminent or deferred, it is the only course that will prevent China from falling under the exclusive domination of Russia, which would be the gravest menace for everybody.

The practical question which the American public has to decide, and which I wish to invest with some interest for American readers, is, What will be America's share in a partition of China?

*North American Review for March, 1899.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am aware that there is a preliminary question still nominally undecided, as to whether the American people should interest or at all events commit, themselves in problems of government and conquest beyond the limits of their continent. Very few American citizens are not asking themselves the question, Can we wisely, or even possibly, depart from the Monroe doctrine so as to include dependencies and conquests in the Republic? Even with regard to the Philippines, America's by the sword, where the task is not rendered more complicated and difficult by the interpolation of any outside claims or influences, as must be the case in China, no final, irrevocable decision has yet been taken toward laying the foundation stone of an American Colonial Empire. However reluctant the American people may be to take the plunge into the unknown, it seems to the on-looker that they have gone too far to draw back without loss of dignity and self-respect. They cannot make themselves a party to a hollow and ephemeral gift of autonomy to the Philippines, when they must know that their withdrawal would be at once followed by the enforcement of the German pretensions, which they only just anticipated two years ago. Committed to the task of ending Spanish misrule in the Pacific, neither the timidity arising from inexperience in colonial administration, nor the engrossing pursuit of material prosperity under conditions which make the United States "the spoilt child of Fortune" among the nations, will allow them to take their hand from the plough till their work is done. Nor can it be supposed for a moment that the people of America will voluntarily decline to take a share in the arrangement of the affairs of China because it presents difficulties, and must entail responsibilities. The modifications introduced into the Monroe doctrine for the comparatively small local question of the Philippines will have to be enlarged or extended so far as to embrace the vast, complicated and pregnant problem of China.

Evidence of these truths has already been afforded in the prominent part American diplomacy took in obtaining general assent to the theory of the Open Door, which represents common interest among all States that will prove far more durable than the Chinese Empire. The enforcement of this principle has to be provided for, not merely during the uncertain life of the existing Chinese administration, but also under the far more onerous conditions that will come into force when it has disappeared.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Something far more definite and binding than the promises given to Mr. Conger will be needed to keep ambitious potentates and aggressive cabinets in the straight path of tolerance for others. The United States have made a formal and emphatic statement as to what they expect from other Governments. They have demanded unrestricted trade privileges and freedom, the whole of China is to be free from prohibitive duties, and all the Treaty Powers are to enjoy equal rights and the same tariff. The assent given to these demands, under one set of circumstances, is not to be ignored or put aside because new conditions have supervened. But to keep it in force will require far more vigorous action than was expected when "the open door" first became a popular phrase. It will not be enough for the United States Government to express a hope or a wish, to qualify its military preparations with a declaration that, in no eventuality, are they intended for war, or to leave England to bear alone the stress and heat of the day. The United States took an honorable lead in the process of arranging the Chinese question through Mr. Conger's dispatch. They cannot back out of the whole business because events have moved with unexpected celerity, or because dark clouds appear on the political horizon. They must see the game out, whether it has to be played on the green cloth of diplomacy or "the ensanguined field of Mars." A regretful glance backwards is permissible, but the American people have crossed the Rubicon of imperial responsibility.

Having done so, they must equip themselves so that they may meet these new obligations with a dignity and skill worthy of their name and power; and the point which I expressly wish to bring before them is that they should supplement the accepted theory of the Open Door with a policy that will take its place at the approaching critical moment, and that will second England's efforts to prevent Russia's obtaining the preponderance in China. The Open Door theory possesses obvious recommendations, and it will continue to serve as a connecting bond between the Governments when China has been broken into fragments. But its chances of future, practical value depend on the acquisition by those who advocate it of adequate territorial jurisdiction, or rather of spheres of influence in the future partition of China. Unless this precautionary measure is taken, it may reasonably be feared that the Open Door theory will be exploded, to the loss and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confusion of those who may have clung to it too long. Therefore, wisdom dictates that deliberately and in good time each of the great Powers should indicate and claim what it considers would be its best sphere of influence and responsibility in a partition of China. The claim might not have to be enforced for a long time, if at all; as the work to be accomplished in China should be rather of a constructive than a destructive character. Each Power would accept the responsibility of maintaining order, security and freedom of trade, besides other Treaty rights, within its sphere; and, in the first place, there would be little or no interference with the existing Chinese administration or system of laws. Partition would not necessarily mean conquest, and it is probable that the Chinese themselves would create, with very little guidance or direction, administrations that would suffice for all practical purposes and render any conquest unnecessary. The work that has to be done in China is creative and restorative. A better feeling toward foreigners has to be evoked, and something like ordinary honesty and efficiency has to be restored to Chinese government.

The task, even in its most restricted sense, is too big to be entrusted to any single State. There are, indeed, only two States which would seriously think of undertaking it with a general mandate, or in pursuit of their own separate ambitions. They are Russia and Japan; and to neither could the rest of the world safely entrust the disciplining of China's millions, and their absorption in the systems of those two aggressive Empires. England, but only with America's co-operation, might have the strength to bring the work to a successful ending for the common good, but she has not the will. Public opinion in England would regard as a madman the individual who would suggest adding the burden of a Chinese Empire to that already borne in India and South Africa. It will support a compromise, a postponement of responsibility in the Far East, as long as possible; and, when it finds that a decision must be taken, the widest range of its action will be within the sphere which has already been denoted as belonging to British interests. There is no want of sincerity in the timely decision to supplement the adhesion to the Open Door principle with the formation of a clear and definite plan to make the phrase a reality in the part of China which is essential to Pan-English trade. That plan has been adopted with greater

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vagueness and uncertainty than the importance of the matter and the perils of the hour demand, but still with sufficient clearness so long as the heart of the Empire beats true. The Yangtsze Valley has been declared a British reservation, and the statement has received solemn indorsement by appearing in a Blue Book. As all the world knows, it does not depend on the official imprimatur; its value is bound up in English naval superiority.

England is not the only Power that has defined, so far as words go, a sphere of influence. France has acted similarly in Southern China, where, with greater precision but less power, she has laid claim to the provinces of Kwang-se, Kwei-chow and part, if not the whole, of Yun-nan. It is unnecessary for the moment to inquire how far that claim violates the reversionary rights of India in the hinterland of Burmah. In the same way as France has done, Germany has announced that she regards the province of Shan-tung as specially appertaining to her, and the theory of "the hinterland" is one that the countrymen of Prince Bismarck know how to work for all it is worth. The German appetite is so good that, in any partition of China, one province would scarcely suffice to satisfy it. Japan also, with one paw over on Corea, claims the province of Fuh-keen and its admirable port of Foochow. Italy will not resign her hopes of San-mun Bay, Austria has still to be satisfied, and Belgium will claim a "neutral" port, or settlement perhaps, at Hankow, as a mode of adjusting some future Anglo-Russian difference. All these Powers have more or less clearly announced their expectations that a certain piece of Tom Tiddler's ground is to fall to their share. Two States alone have held back from making any similar declarations, Russia and America, but from very different motives. Russia regards as her sphere the territory covered by her Cossacks, and the watchword of her extreme representatives is that the whole of China, and indeed of Asia, is to fall to her share. With such views, the definition of a sphere in any circumscribed portion of China would be useless.

America has not defined a sphere of influence or action, because she has not long approached the consideration of the subject with any serious intention of taking part in its settlement. Recent events have had much to do with any decision she may have formed or be in process of forming; and, for a time, the belief in the Open Door panacea may have encouraged the hope that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no more definite or committing step need be taken than to call upon the Governments to subscribe to an admirable general principle. The extraordinary outbreak of animosity in China against all foreigners, accompanied by the collapse of the existing government, so far at least as the discharge of its responsible functions goes, has dispelled these expectations, and brings home to everybody the need of prompt and strenuous action. While it is tolerably clear what direction the plans of other Powers will take, over and beyond the assertion and enforcement of certain common rights and principles which none of them is yet disposed to see broken or destroyed in China, the plans of the United States are still shrouded in darkness, because they have not, as a matter of fact, been formed. The time has arrived, however, when a decision cannot wisely be any longer deferred, because the area of unappropriated, or rather unclaimed, sphere in China is rapidly diminishing and may soon disappear. Of course, there is no need for a decision if the United States are content to play the passive part of a mere looker-on in the settlement of the Chinese question, and to limit their diplomatic action to the enunciation of admirable platitudes. But they can only stultify themselves in China at the cost of future losses and even dangers; for, in the evolution of the Chinese people, is wrapped up the destinies of the human race.

Taking the more natural view of what America's policy will have to be, and assuming that she, like other Powers, will have to supplement her support of the general principle of the Open Door, with a claim to a definite sphere in China, the practical question follows, What and where is that sphere to be? The diminishing area available renders a prompt decision necessary, for America may find herself supplanted by other contestants. Speaking practically, there are only two areas on the extensive seaboard of China left available that would suffice in themselves to meet America's claims and legitimate expectations. They are, first, the province of Che-keang, with the ports of Ning-po and Hang-chow, the famous Kinsai of Marco Polo; and, secondly, the northern part of the province of Kwang-tung, with the port of Swatow, to which might be added, by arrangement with Japan, Amoy, across the frontier of Fuh-keen. There would be some disadvantages in encroaching on a different province, and if America would accept the responsibility for Canton, there would be no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessity to claim Amoy, which would thus be left in the Japanese sphere. The opinion may be hazarded that the province of Che-keang represents the preferable American sphere. It is more compact, and the immediate responsibilities would not be such as to deter or discourage American administrators on the threshold of their task. Canton itself represents the most difficult separate problem in China, because it is a focus of anti-foreign animosity and of perhaps the greatest ruffianism in the whole country. The Power accepting responsibility for the Kwang-tung province will, sooner or later, have to deal with it.

When the question as to what America's sphere in China should be, first presented itself to my mind, the most attractive form seemed to be a joint Anglo-American sphere, because it could have embraced a larger part of China, and thus present a national form of government south of the Yellow River (Hoang-ho). But America has held back too long, and opinion is too much divided in the States to render such a project practicable. The enormously preponderant interests of England in China render it impossible for her to delay her measures for the convenience of any one else, or to subordinate her policy to the movements and intentions of any other Power. An Anglo-American sphere would be an ideal arrangement; but, unfortunately, American opinion is not sufficiently pronounced at this moment to render it practicable. We must, therefore, fall back on the separate sphere for America, which, practically speaking, can only be established in two quarters. The first step in the claim of a sphere is easy and surprisingly simple. The United States Government, like the German, the Japanese, the French and the English Governments before it, makes the announcement that it regards, let me say, the province of Che-keang as its sphere. The statement is duly noted. Nobody protests, nobody applauds, yet on Time's iron tablets every one knows that an important notch has been made. America will then have left the benches to enter the arena.

Having denoted the sphere, America becomes an active partner with the other Powers in the regulation of the Chinese question, and she commits herself to the specific task of doing what good government, security of life and trade demand in her sphere. How it is to be done is a question for the future and also for each Government to settle according to its own lights. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preliminary stage of study and investigation will probably prove one of many years, and in some of the spheres active intervention, in any other form than advice and possibly admonition, would never become necessary. A partition of China in the manner indicated does not necessarlly imply its conquest. It signifies, primarily, the easier treatment of a vast subject, by its subdivision among a number of interested parties or States. It also signifies for the rest of the world that no single State shall be permitted to develop and utilize the latent strength and resources of China for its own purposes and policy. The policy of partition among spheres of interest and, if necessary, of action may be described as one of precaution and vigilance. By directly interesting the great body of the Powers in the work, a policy of assurance may be considered to have been taken out against the undue aggrandisement of any one of them. When the Governments announce that they are directly interested in what happens or has to be done at one spot, they will watch more closely what is being done at other spots, lest it should encroach on their rights or prove the harbinger of peril to the common interest and weal. It is a partition of interest, interference and control to which the world is being invited in China, and not of conquest. The present events, however they turn out, must prove fatal to the existing Chinese Government. The period of hoodwinking by the Tsung-li-Yamen must be ended, as well as that of irresponsibility among the officials with whom we have to conduct business. Whether the Chinese authority be an Emperor or a Viceroy, it must be clear, first, that he understands the rights of those who are in treaty relations with his country and possess formally conceded privileges; and, secondly, that he has the power as well as the will to perform his part of the transaction. We may pity the ill-starred and well-meaning young Emperor, Kwang-hsu, but we cannot safely regard him as the *deus ex machinâ* who is to save the situation. And if Kwang-hsu is not possible, then it may reasonably be doubted whether any other member of the present ruling Manchu family would be eligible. For it cannot be overlooked that the present outbreak has been mainly due to the Manchu element in the Government, and to the bitter and implacable hostility of the Princes of the reigning House. It almost looks as if the Tartars, believing their supremacy to be menaced between the demands of the Foreign Powers and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

propaganda of the native Chinese Reform movement, had decided to enter upon a life and death struggle with the foreign devils, in the hope of expelling them forever and thus saving their own position. To entertain such a scheme reveals no doubt extreme ignorance, but all the available evidence before the Boxer outbreak pointed to the conclusion that nothing had been learnt at Peking; and those in diplomatic relations with the Chinese reported, after Li Hung Chang's return from Europe, that both he and the Dowager Empress had become more reactionary than ever. Among the princes, ministers and diplomatists of the existing rotten régime in China there is none capable of forming a new, sound administration. They are more than incapable; they are not even willing.

Whatever chance of internal reform there may be in China must be sought for in a different direction, and new men can alone supply the material out of which a reformed administration can be constructed. That such men are to be found cannot be doubted; and the example of Kang-yu-wei is encouraging for those who believe that, amid the chaos of Chinese affairs, and the catastrophes still awaiting the ancient system of their race, the Chinese will themselves be able, with some external assistance and direction, to restore order in their own household in, say, the next half century. They have the old Confucian dictum that "after long union must come disunion, and after that again will be reunion," and they know that seven centuries have elapsed since the Middle Kingdom was divided between the Lungs and the Kins, and that before them the sub-division of the country into several kingdoms was no uncommon feature in its history. The fact that daunts foreigners in prescribing for the sick man of the Far East, viz., that he may go to pieces under treatment, has no terrors for a Chinese reformer, who knows that the provinces could be grouped into kingdoms, and that any amelioration of the situation must first be local and progressive before it becomes general and national. If thoughtful and instructed Chinese were taken as counsellors by the foreigners in each of the spheres, their advice would be to interfere as little as possible with the fabric of the existing administration, and indeed to restrict all interference at first to restraining the corruption of the officials, controlling the revenue and expenditure, and softening the cruel penal code. These changes would be so popular that little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or no coercion would be needed to give them effect. The direct responsibility incurred by the partitioning Powers would be far less than is thought, and the task that seems so formidable at a distance might, on closer inspection, prove exceedingly light. That it is a task for the good of the world cannot be doubted, and it is equally certain that sooner or later the Powers will have to take it in hand. What is not so certain, for the moment, is whether the United States will lend a hand in the work, or stand aloof.

This uncertainty brings us back to the question with which we started, "Where and what America's share in a partition of China is to be." A decision on the question cannot be safely deferred. The area left open is diminishing, the number of competitors is increasing, and those who face the responsibility before all the Treaty Powers in China will not show any consideration for those who shirk it, when the rewards have to be divided. The responsibility is not adequately faced by declarations in support of an Open Door, when the mansion behind it is in flames. The period when Mr. Conger's dispatch was the feature of the question is quite recent in point of time, but it is already ancient history. A momentous decision has to be taken, and that within a brief period, as to whether America will participate in the imminent disruption of the Chinese Empire. Her standing out will not prevent the contingency, which may be pronounced inevitable; but it will somewhat alter the form in which the problem will present itself for solution. It will be a form more unfavorable and more onerous for England, the champion of the Open Door under all circumstances, and the abstention of the United States will encourage not only Russia, but France and Germany also, to make their spheres exclusive to outside trade and special reserves for their own. The consequences of this shrinking from honorable responsibilitiy at the psychological moment for action must be felt by America herself, not so much, perhaps, in the immediate present as in the future; but I will not obscure the fact that it must also prove very injurious to England, who is in special need at this moment of moral support and backing. She has to face the open rivalry of Russia, the secret rancor of France, and the very questionable good faith of Germany. The alliance of Japan alone is not sufficient to enable her to successfully confront so formidable a coalition, based on a common sentiment of jealousy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and dislike. Only the hearty co-operation of America can adjust the balance, and warm the chilled friendship of Germany into something like community of action.

The partition of China, which recent events have rendered practically certain, is not as formidable a contingency as has been imagined, provided that America agrees to take her legitimate share in it. Far from precipitating the arrival of Armageddon, as some alarmists affect to believe, it would tend to peace, because separate ambitions have to be subordinated to the general opinions and wishes of the Powers. America's abstention would alter the outlook, and the Continental Powers would combine to squeeze England, when war would inevitably follow for the maintenance of her Empire. If she were beaten by numbers, that dire event would signify the door more firmly closed than ever in China, and the United States would be the next mark of an anti-English league. If she were victorious, there would still remain on the debit side the cost and sacrifices of an unnecessarily colossal struggle, due to the abstention of America, with the consequent alienation of two great, kindred nations, which acting together might control and improve the destinies of the world.

I hope I have made it clear that the partition policy in China does not imply conquest. It would be an acceptance of responsibility, and each partner would agree to do a certain portion of work. The Governments having agreed among themselves that the only practical way of dealing with the Chinese problem is to sub-divide it into certain parts for each of them to work upon, would in the next place hold a conference for the enumeration and acceptance of common principles of action, and for the division of the responsibilities of the defunct Chinese Empire.

It would thus be made clear that the Powers had resolved to treat the Chinese question as a common interest, and to take timely steps to prevent the Yellow Peril from becoming a menace to them all. The work in which America is asked to take her share is a highly honorable one, and from the human point of view of the deepest interest. She can only refuse her co-operation by taking a lower seat in the family of nations, who will see in her abstention the selfish indulgence of her good fortune in possessing a position of splendid isolation.

DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAUSES OF ANTI-FOREIGN FEELING IN CHINA.

BY GEORGE B. SMYTH, PRESIDENT OF THE ANGLO-CHINESE COLLEGE, FOOCHOW.

WHAT are the causes of the present anti-foreign outburst in North China, and what are the reasons for the bitter anti-foreign spirit which prevails throughout the Empire, and which is kept from springing into universal action only by the firmness of some enlightened and far-seeing Viceroys? I wish to answer both these questions, and in the order in which I have here stated them; though it would probably be more logical to answer the more general question first, as the present situation is to a large extent but a specially malignant outbreak of a disorder which infects the whole Chinese system. Nevertheless, as the terrible crisis in North China is the subject of more immediate interest, it will not be inappropriate to consider it before taking up the larger subject which the second question presents. In discussing these questions, my chief desire is to be entirely fair; and yet it may happen that some will think me too warm an advocate of the Chinese. I shall, indeed, have to present the Chinese side, since no one can justly write of the antagonism of China toward foreigners without showing how large a share the foreigners themselves have had in producing it. The subject is on that account not a pleasant one for us of the West to think of; for, in studying it, we shall see much to be ashamed of, and find that much of the prejudice and hatred of Western men and Western institutions of which we so bitterly complain in the Chinese is due to ourselves, to the way in which we introduced ourselves among them, and to the way in which we have often since treated them. Western injustice toward the East is the cause of much of the Eastern hatred of the West. Nay, more, it will be seen that, when we were moved by the purest and loftiest motives, we did not succeed in making

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ourselves welcome. Through ignorance or zeal or the coincidence of unhappy accidents, our very benevolence has itself been misunderstood and offensive.

The first question, as to the causes of the present anti-foreign outbreak in North China, may be put in another form: Who are the Boxers, and how and why have they become what they are? For these people are everywhere considered the cause of the present disturbance, and the chief agents in its murderous crusade against foreigners.

The Boxers are a patriotic secret society; but, as in the case of all other such associations in China, their origin and history are difficult to trace. Though it is but a year since the society began to attract public attention by its depredations against foreigners, it is said to have been in existence for several years. It seems at first to have been partly an athletic association, and partly a kind of mutual protective organization, for defense against the roving bands of robbers which sometimes infest the province of Shan-tung; and it was called by the name which has since become infamous, the "Righteous Harmonious Fist," translated for brevity by the short and expressive word "Boxers." It is certain that it showed no special hostility toward the native Christians, and gave no trouble to missionaries or other foreigners. The question, then, is how to account for the change which made of this society of men, associated to oppose the lawlessness of freebooters, the most cruel and blood-thirsty anti-foreign organization in the history of China. The reasons must be sought in the recent history of Shan-tung, and they are not hard to discover.

Up to the fall of 1897, Shan-tung enjoyed an excellent reputation for its treatment of foreigners and native Christians; indeed, there were more Christians in that province than in any other in the Empire, except Fuh-keen. On the 1st of November of that year, however, there was a riot in which two German Catholic missionaries were brutally murdered, and Germany promptly seized upon the crime as a pretext for what it had long contemplated, the seizure of a portion of Chinese territory. On the 14th, Admiral Diedrichs landed troops at Kiao Chow, and negotiations were entered upon for the formal cession to Germany of that which she had already seized. On the 6th of the following March, a treaty was signed at Peking by which the country round about the Bay of Kiao Chow, as far inland as the neighboring hills, was ceded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the German Empire for ninety-nine years; the Governor of Shan-tung was dismissed, six other high officials removed, an indemnity of 3,000 taels paid, and a promise made to build three "expiatory" chapels. Germany obtained in addition a concession for two railways in the province, and the right to open mines within a region of territory twenty kilomètres wide along them. These were hard terms, but that which was most bitterly resented was the seizure of territory. This high-handed act worked an ominous change in the attitude of the people toward foreigners, and especially Germans. It was not safe for Germans in small companies to travel in the interior, and three who later unwisely did so were attacked, though they fortunately escaped with their lives. To punish the perpetrators of what the German Government chose to consider another unprovoked crime, the commander of Kiao Chow immediately sent troops to the scene of the attack, and they burned down two villages. This harsh and indiscriminate retaliation, in which innocent suffered as well as guilty, inflamed the people to madness, and many foreigners predicted serious results. These were not long in coming. A bitter anti-Christian, anti-foreign spirit showed itself throughout the province, which was later intensified by the Imperial Decree of March 15th of last year, issued on the demand of France, conferring practically official rank on Roman Catholic bishops and missionaries. The position of equality with Viceroys and Governors thus given to the bishops, and equality with provincial treasurers, provincial judges, taotais and prefects given to the various orders of priests, together with the right of interview without the mediation of consul or minister, gave the Roman Catholics an influence of which the people had good reason to believe they would not be slow to avail themselves. In lawsuits between their adherents and non-Christian people, the latter had, or thought they had, no chance; and, as in other provinces, there was general complaint of the constant interference of the priests in litigation.

Enraged at the injustice thus perpetrated, seeing in the missionaries and the Germans the causes of the country's humiliation, and in the conduct of the latter especially the beginning of an attempt by the foreigners to seize the province and, finally, the whole Empire, the Boxers began the series of crimes which have since made them infamous, preached a patriotic, anti-Christian, anti-foreign propaganda, and resolved to drive from the country

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the intruders, and all that they represented. They also made claims to strange spiritual powers to influence the public. They practised hypnotism, and the effects which they thus produced on individuals awed the multitude into a belief in their possession of mysterious, supernatural powers. It came in time to be believed that they could make those who joined them impervious to the bullets of foreigners. The "Boxer spirit" movement, as it accordingly came to be called, spread like wildfire, and led to frightful excesses, the burning of churches, the slaughter of native Christians, the murder of missionaries.

Such, in brief outline, is the history of the rise of the Boxer movement in Shan-tung. But how did it come to spread till it covered the whole province, invaded the metropolitan province of Chi-li, took possession of the capital itself, and now holds within its grasp the persons, alive or dead we know not, of the ministers of the great Powers of the West? There is but one answer—by the connivance of the officials, by the treachery of the Governor of Shan-tung, acting under direct orders from the Empress Dowager herself. Had this wretched and cruel woman been so minded, and had she so ordered, the movement could have been crushed long before it became dangerous; but she refused even to attempt to put it down, and degraded any official who was honest enough to oppose it and protect the Christians and foreigners within his jurisdiction. And all because she thought she saw in the strength of the uprising, in its fierce fanaticism, in its murderous hostility to foreigners the means of accomplishing the most cherished ambition, both of herself and of the bigoted crew of Manchu reactionaries who surrounded her, the expulsion from China of all foreigners and of all the ideas, religious, social and political, which foreigners represent. That this charge is not groundlessly made is shown by the simple fact that Yuan-Shih-kai, the Governor of Shan-tung, and his predecessor, Yu-Hsieu, under both of whom the Boxer uprising has grown, were her own appointees, acting under her immediate orders. The *North China Herald,* the best informed and most ably edited foreign paper in China, in its issue of June 6th, after showing how Governor Yu, because of his intense hatred of foreigners and all Chinese who had anything to do with them, gave open help and encouragement to the Boxers, for which his dismissal was demanded by one of the foreign ministers, says:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"There can be no question about the Boxers having been encouraged by the government, because Yu Hsieu, their patron, after having been recalled to Peking from Shan-tung, was specially honored by the Empress Dowager, and given the Governorship of Shan-se. Yuan-Shih-kai, the new Governor of Shan-tung, could easily have put down the Boxers when he first went to Chinanfu, the provincial capital, but he was not allowed to."

Who prevented him? Who could have prevented him but the Empress Dowager, to whom he owed his appointment, and whose servant he was? These two men, Yu and Yuan, allowed the fiendish work to go on, because she wished it; at a word from her, they would have crushed it. Again, the conduct of which she is here accused is in complete accord with her course ever since, in September of 1898, she deposed the unhappy Emperor for his too zealous devotion to reform, and took the power of the throne into her own hands. Since then, she has seized and beheaded six leaders of the Reform party, banished many more, and dismissed from office every official, not too powerful to be touched, who has shown the least sympathy with the new order. Kang-Yu-Wei, the chief adviser of the Emperor, and the head and front of the movement, she has pursued with implacable vengeance; as recently as the 14th of last February, she offered a reward of a hundred thousand taels for his capture, alive or dead.

That the Boxer outbreak has thus grown to its present terrible proportions largely through her support, given both openly and in secret, is not a matter of inference, but of positive knowledge. If, as late cablegrams report, she has herself fallen a victim to its fury, and has been made a prisoner in the palace, or been poisoned, by the Boxer leader, Tsai-Yi, the Prince of Tuan, one of her special favorites—a man to whom, by a decree of January 31st last, she granted two extra steps in official rank and a eulogistic tablet written by the imperial hand, and whom by a decree of the 7th of March she made Second President of the Imperial Clan Court—it only shows how well her ministers have learned the lesson which she taught them. The fury of even her hatred of foreigners was too mild for some of her favorites. If she seems to have shrunk from the horrors to which her own infamous course has led, they shrink at nothing, not even at the attempted wholesale butchery of the foreign ministers themselves. But the guilt of the movement, with its awful record of crimes, the widespread destruction of property, the massacre of native Christians, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

murders of foreigners, the whole terrible tragedy now being enacted in the North, is chiefly hers.

It is time now to consider the second question proposed at the head of this article: What are the reasons for the bitter, anti-foreign spirit which prevails throughout China? The subject is particularly important, inasmuch as this feeling appears to be of comparatively recent origin. The Chinese have not always shown the hostility to foreigners which so generally characterizes them now. Colquhoun, in his "China in Transformation," says:

"Before the advent of the Manchus China maintained constant relations with the countries of Asia; traders from Arabia, Persia, and India trafficked in Chinese ports and passed into the interior. The tablet of Sian Fu shows that missionaries from the West were propagating the Christian religion in the eighth century; in the thirteenth, Marco Polo was not only cordially received, but held office in the Empire, and at that time the Christian religious ceremonies were tolerated at Peking, where there was an Archbishop. To the close of the last Chinese dynasty (1644), the Jesuit missionaries were well received and treated at the capital; and, as Huc remarks, the first Tartar Emperors merely tolerated what they found existing. This would seem to show conclusively that the Chinese did not formerly have the aversion to foreigners which is usually assumed."

How are we to account for the change? No one cause produced it; it is the result of a cumulation of causes all working toward the same end.

As the beginning of the change coincided in a general way with the Manchu conquest, in the first half of the seventeenth century, the first and most obvious explanation is that it is due, in part, to the policy of the conquerors. This is the view taken by Huc in his well-known book, "The Chinese Empire." He says:

"The Manchoos were, on account of the smallness of their numbers in the midst of this vast Empire, compelled to adopt stringent measures to preserve their conquest. For fear that foreigners should be tempted to snatch their prey from them, they have carefully closed the ports of China against them, thinking thus to secure themselves from ambitious attempts from without."

With the exception of the large-minded Kang-Hsi, the greatest of all the Manchu sovereigns, this has been the general policy of the present dynasty. No concession has ever been gained from it except by force, or the threat of force. It has done everything in its power to make friendly relations with the West impossible. It was only in 1842 that the first ports, Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo and Shanghai, were opened to commerce, and that after a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war in which China was worsted. The opening of ports in the Yang-tsze River was by way of indemnity for the murder of Margary, a British consular officer, in 1874. Others have been opened as the result of diplomatic threats, and still others in consequence of the war with Japan. It was by force, too, that China was compelled to enter into diplomatic relations with Western States. The right of their ministers to reside in Peking, and freedom of residence and travel in the interior, both had to be fought for, and were acknowledged only after defeat in war. The Manchu Dynasty has given nothing which was not wrung from it; it has made no concessions of its own accord; it has never taken a single step toward putting its relations with foreign powers on a footing of sincere friendship. And the policy of the rulers has been carried out by the Mandarins, most of whom have ceaselessly striven to make foreign residence in China a painful experience, and to embitter by every means in their power the relations between the foreigners and the people. The terrible situation in North China to-day is but the natural result of this exclusive, anti-foreign policy; the Manchus are making a last desperate effort to expel the West and all that the West stands for from the Empire.

In the changes which the ideas of foreigners, if allowed their proper influence on the people, would effect, they see their own destruction, and are fighting for that which for two centuries and a half they have exercised, the right to misrule and plunder the nation which they conquered. Unhappily, the people do not understand the facts, and centuries of precept and example have taught them to feel for the foreigner part of the hatred with which their rulers are drunk.

It would be fortunate if the Manchus alone were to blame for the anti-foreign feeling of China. Unhappily, the foreigners themselves have had a large share in creating it. The circumstances attending the first introduction of Europeans to the Chinese were such as to give that people the impression that the visitors were little better than pirates and murderers, and not a little has occurred since to deepen that unhappy feeling. "Rapine, murder, and a constant appeal to force," says Gorst, "chiefly characterized the commencement of Europe's commercial intercourse with China." When the first Portuguese traders visited that country in the sixteenth century, they were well received; but they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were soon followed by a horde of unscrupulous adventurers, who sometimes forced their way into the interior and committed high-handed acts of piracy. So incensed were the Chinese at this violence that, when Portugal, a few years later, sent an ambassador to Peking, he was sent back to Canton, thrown there into prison and finally executed.

Still more deplorable was the impression made by the Spaniards. After they seized the Philippine Islands in 1543, a great expansion of trade with China resulted; and such large numbers of Chinese settlers went there that in time they outnumbered the Europeans in the proportion of twenty-five to one. The Spaniards saw in this great influx of Chinese immigrants a menace to their own sovereignty, and they massacred the larger part of the defenceless and innocent Chinese.* The impression which such savage butchery of its people made on their native province of Canton may easily be imagined, and partly accounts both for the reception which the English met with in the following century when they first entered the Canton River, and for the fact that the people of that province are, with the exception of those of Hu-nan, the most truculent haters of foreigners in China.

The early Dutch and English adventurers had also a share in blackening the reputation of Europe in the East, and it is not surprising that the Chinese came in time to look upon all Europeans as barbarians, men whose only objects were robbery and war.

The period of unblushing barbarism came to an end at last, and Europe set about entering into relations with China on the principles of international law. But, even then, the claims made to equality, however reasonable and just, gave great offense to the Chinese Government and people. To understand this, it is necessary to consider a peculiarity of Chinese civilization too often overlooked—its age-long isolation.

The civilization of China is the development of its own national genius and life. Of no nation in the West can this be affirmed. The countries of America and Europe have been so closely related on terms of equality that the civilization of no one of them can be said to be entirely its own. They have so acted and reacted, one upon another, by physical force and moral and intellectual influences, that the civilized life of each is the development, not of its own national genius merely, but that modified

*See "China," by H. E. Gorst, pp. 202, 203.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in many and various directions by the civilization of each of the others. Vastly different have been the conditions under which the civilization of China has grown. With the exception of India, to which she owes Buddhism, I do not know to what other country she is indebted for anything. She has been surrounded by peoples who, in all the great qualities of life, were vastly inferior to her. She developed a splendid literature, an elaborate system of social customs, a noble system of ethics, and they are all her own. Her own, too, were some of the greatest inventions of man—gunpowder, printing, and the mariner's compass. Beginning at a time which antedates the birth of every other nation now living, she has developed, with the exception already noted, her own national life, learning nothing from her neighbors and teaching them all, the quick, intelligent Japanese no less than the slow, phlegmatic Corean. Such a history naturally taught her to look upon herself as the first of nations; she was acknowledged as such by all the nations around her. The inevitable result followed; she looked upon all other countries as her inferiors. When, therefore, men went to her from Europe, not only claiming equality, but professing to be able to teach her, it was a shock to the national pride not easy for the West to appreciate. It is not pleasant for a people who have thought themselves the chosen of the world, and who, it must be admitted, had, under the circumstances, some reason for thinking so, to be summoned to sit at the feet of men whom their peculiar history and recent experience had taught them to look upon as barbarians. The claim to equality, then, made by foreigners in their relations with China has been a cause of offense, a fruitful source of antagonism. If it be said that the claim was right, and that China has had time to learn the folly of her conservatism and the madness of her intolerant national pride, let it be remembered that the feelings of a nation do not easily change, that the prejudices of centuries cannot be overcome by the teachings of a decade.

Another source of friction and bitterness, this time with the Mandarins, has been the attempt to enforce some of the commercial clauses of the treaties, particularly those relating to the abolition of inland taxes on foreign goods. On such importations, between the port of entry and their destination in the interior, a tax called "likin" is levied at various customs barriers on the way. This is a serious burden on foreign trade, and it has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provided by treaty that imported goods shall be exempt from such charges on payment at the port of entry of an extra sum equal to half the regular import tariff. As the duty so levied would all be paid to the Central Government, it follows that the local administration would thereby be deprived of a large part of its customary revenues. Two results would ensue—difficulty in meeting the expenses of the provincial governments, and a large curtailment of the perquisites or "squeezes" of the officials. It is often, indeed, claimed that the latter are simply robbery, and the cutting off of this source of personal revenue from the Mandarins would be an act of justice. But this is not entirely true. The salaries of the officials are so miserably inadequate to meet their necessary expenses that the officials are compelled to resort to various illegal methods to add to them. That they do so excessively, "squeezing" all that the business will allow, is but too true; but that does not alter the fact that the administrative system whose servants they are forces them to the practice of illegal and dishonest expedients. Before, therefore, the treaty clauses dealing with this subject can be quietly enforced, such administrative changes must be made as will remove from the provincial authorities their greatest temptation to robbery. Until this is done, and it will not be done without pressure from without, there will remain a fruitful source of official antagonism to foreigners, a cause of friction irritable alike to Chinese Mandarins and to foreign officials and merchants.

Missions and missionaries, both Catholic and Protestant, have also added to the causes of antagonism. I am aware that this is denied by many of those who are interested in missions, but no one will question it who is acquainted with the facts. It is not wise to argue from the nobility of the missionary motive to its ready appreciation by the Chinese people. The motive, so apparent to us, is not equally apparent to them. They look at it through a medium of unfortunate accompaniments of which we never think. Apart altogether from the offense to the national pride involved in undertaking to teach a faith claiming to be higher than their own, the whole missionary movement is unhappily associated with conquest, and its toleration is the result of successful war. Noble, therefore, though the motives of the Christian Church are, its work is tainted by its association with force and conquest. To thoughtful Chinese familiar with the recent history of their country, the presence of the missionary in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every province, in country villages as well as in great cities, is a reminder of the national humiliation. There are, indeed, exceptions; there are among the leading classes men who look upon the Christian missionaries as China's best and only disinterested friends, and the number of such is happily increasing; but for the present at least the vast majority do not think so.

There are two things in missionary work which distinctly add to the causes of irritation—one, the teaching itself; the other, the partly foreign, partly Chinese political status of those who accept it. They are mistaken who suppose that, because of the excellence of Christianity, it must lead only to peace and has nothing in it to give occasion for offense. The preaching of it is not the innocuous thing which it is sometimes considered. Like every high moral force, when it confronts a lower, conflict is inevitable. The instinct of self-preservation compels the adherents of the old faith to fight for its existence. Christianity not only creates, it also destroys; it sets up new beliefs, new ideals, new standards of conduct, a new object of worship, but it pulls down the old. This is its necessary record everywhere else; it is its record in China.

In religious matters, the Chinese are among the most tolerant of men; but in their case Christianity is opposed to a practice which has prevailed from the very beginning of their history, on which they think the whole fabric of society is based. The opposition of Christianity to ancestral worship is what offends the Chinese most, for they consider it an attack on the most sacred of obligations, on the very foundation of society itself. Missionaries are aware of this, and most of them are scrupulously careful in speaking of it. I have heard many sermons and addresses by them in the seventeen years which I have spent in China, but never one in which the ancestral cult was spoken of offensively. But, while speaking tenderly, the opposition to it is there; the churches have adopted toward it a position of uncompromising hostility, and the people know it. Here lies one of the chief sources of popular hostility to foreigners, and there is no way of avoiding it, unless the policy of toleration be adopted which was followed by the early Jesuits. But, as this was rejected by the Catholics themselves on command of the Pope, it is not likely to be adopted by them again, and it certainly never will be by the Protestants. What, then, is to be done? The thoughtless, ignorant whereof they speak, will say: "Withdraw, rather than con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinue an enterprise so provocative of hostility." But this is impossible. The Christian Church must preach Christianity. To ask it to reject its missionary commission is to ask it to commit suicide. No nation has ever yet been Christianized without conflict, and no nation ever will be. Nevertheless, it is unwise not to recognize in the preaching of the new faith a source of antagonism, and it is unjust to censure the Chinese too severely for their opposition to what they do not clearly understand, to a process which they regard as destructive of the fundamental principles of their national life. With the years will come knowledge, but it will come only after opposition and strife.

Two lessons, at least, may be learned from this, namely, the tremendous responsibility which our Missionary Societies incur in sending missionaries to China, and the solemn obligation under which such responsibility puts them to send to that distant, difficult and dangerous field only the choicest men and women they can find. There is no service for which the selection of candidates should be so carefully made. The ordinary qualifications are not sufficient. Zeal alone will not do. Besides the passion for humanity, of which every missionary should be possessed, he should have in addition the great virtues of intellectual sympathy, the power of appreciating another's position, the ability to see the truth where it exists, and tact which is unfailing. With such qualities as these, the missionaries may hope in time to overcome prejudice, make their position clear, and win an acceptance for the great message which they preach. In that message only is China's salvation, for in it alone are the promise and the power to effect the moral regeneration which is her supreme need.

Another cause of bitterness in connection with missionary work is found in the peculiar political status of the native converts, and the immunity from various exactions which the treaties guarantee them. It is often asserted by opponents of missionaries that they are constantly interfering with the ordinary judicial processes of the country, saving their converts from the payment of taxes, and calling upon Consuls and Ministers, irrespective of treaty provisions, to interpose in their behalf. All these charges are untrue, so far, at least, as Protestant missionaries are concerned. Mistakes are sometimes made, but no men are more scrupulous than they in their observance of the laws of the land. Nevertheless, there are real sources of irritation in this connection which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot be denied. The clauses of the treaties which guarantee religious liberty to Chinese converts have usually been interpreted to mean that they shall not be persecuted for religion's sake, and, specifically, that they shall not be compelled to contribute to the maintenance of idol temples, or toward paying the expenses of idol processions. Under these heads, many cases are taken by the missionaries to the Consuls, who then refer them to the Chinese officials. Unfortunately, it sometimes turns out on investigation that the cases do not come within the treaty limits at all, but are old troubles, or even new ones, which the Christian complainants persuaded the missionary were instances of religious persecution. The embarrassment of such a discovery is painful, painful to the missionary who was deceived, to the Consul who took the case up, and to the Chinese Magistrate who tried it. Worse than all is the effect in the village where the parties to the trouble reside, where the Christian is accused of trying to use his relation to the foreigners to crush his neighbors. The resulting irritation and prejudice are lamentable in the extreme.

Even when the cases are genuine, and the Christians are declared by the Magistrate exempt from the exactions referred to, there are two parties offended; the people are angry because some of their neighbors are saved by foreign influence from a pressure which they themselves have to submit to and which becomes heavier in proportion as the Christians are relieved from it; and the Magistrate is humiliated because at the demand of a foreign official he has to give judgment against the wishes of a majority of his own people. Here, therefore, is another widespread source of popular irritation. But how is it to be avoided? The question is too complicated to be discussed here. Some would withdraw Consular protection altogether and leave the converts entirely to the laws of the land. In that case, fairness would demand that the missionaries be treated in the same way and be subject to the same laws. But no class of foreigners in China can be left without protection without endangering the interests, if not the lives, of all. Deny the protection of their country to missionaries, and all other foreigners will speedily find that the protection promised them will be of little avail. The problem is one for statesmen, the thing I wish to note being simply that the peculiar position of converts, the privileges and immunities they enjoy, are among the causes of the antagonism which the Chinese entertain toward

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreigners. These observations are made in no spirit of criticism, but with a sincere desire to draw the attention of the missionary authorities and the Christian public to the facts, in order that the subject may be thoroughly studied, and such regulations be adopted, if possible, as will lessen the area of friction and reduce the number of the causes of trouble.

In addition to all this, missionaries are often thought of as spies of their own governments; and by some of those who are familiar with the history of other parts of Asia, the fate of India is feared for their country. Many a time have I been asked what my Government paid me for coming to China, and when I answered, "Nothing," and showed that I had no connection with the Government whatever, my reply was evidently received with no little incredulity. Again, in the minds of many, the whole missionary movement is suspected because of the striking contrast between its professed aim and the conduct of some Christian governments toward China. And surely this cannot be wondered at. With Western missonaries preaching peace and Western governments practicing murder, it should not surprise us if the Chinese suspect the former as much as they fear the latter. You cannot go to a people with the Bible in one hand and a bludgeon in the other, and expect that they will accept either cheerfully.

Some European governments have been guilty, even in recent times, of the most atrocious conduct toward China. In 1884, a French fleet entered the Min River and anchored ten miles below the great city of Foochow, in Southeastern China, to frighten the government at Peking into paying an indemnity demanded by the French Minister for alleged guilty complicity in helping the people of Tonquin in their fight against the seizure of their country by France. When he failed, the case was given over to the Admiral, the French ships opened fire, and in less than an hour the Chinese fleet, with the exception of one ship, was destroyed and over 3,000 Chinese killed, and all without a declaration of war. The bodies of the dead floated out to sea on the tide, many of them were borne back on the returning current, and for days it was hardly possible to cross the river anywhere between the anchorage and the sea twenty miles below without seeing some of these dreadful reminders of French treachery and brutality. The people of the city were roused to fury, and the foreigners would have been attacked but for the presence of American and English

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gunboats anchored off the settlement to protect them. If some of us had beeen killed the world would have rung with denunciation of Chinese cruelty, but the 3,000 victims of French guns would never have been thought of.

Two years ago the French perpetrated an equally atrocious outrage at Shanghai. Wishing to enlarge their settlement, they desired to obtain possession of a large rest house for the dead which belonged to the people of Ningpo. Failing in negotiations, the French Consul proceeded to tear down the surrounding walls. The people opposed; marines were landed from a French cruiser in the river; they fired on the crowd and killed twenty. The people of other nationalities at Shanghai prepared to defend themselves, but they all knew that any riots, if riots occurred, should be laid to the injustice and brutality of France.

The burning down of villages in Shan-tung by the Germans, to which I have already referred, was an act of the same character.

All these instances of the cruel use of force by foreigners were heralded far and wide by the Chinese newspapers, and the impression made on the people it is not hard to imagine. These papers have also made the reading public aware of the deprivations of territory recently suffered by China, and of the cool discussions of the dismemberment of the Empire indulged in by the foreign press. No wonder the people were humiliated and angry. Many a time have I been asked by thoughtful and patriotic Chinese when the end would come and China cease to be an independent State. All her finest harbors have already been taken; there is not a place on her coast where her fleet can rendezvous, except by the grace of foreigners. Port Arthur, a fortified harbor, on which millions were spent, has been leased to Russia; Wei-Hai-Wei, with its fortifications, on the coast of Shan-tung, to England; Kiao Chow, also in Shan-tung, with the finest bay on the coast of China, large enough to accommodate the fleets of the world, to Germany; and Kwang-Chau bay, on the southern coast of Kwang-tung, to France. There would be some justification for these seizures—for seizures they are, though called only "leases"—if they had been made in retaliation for broken pledges, for crimes for which the government was responsible; but every one knows that, with the apparent exception of Kiao Chow, and the exception is apparent only, they are all due to the mutual fears and mutual jealousies of foreign States. The sovereignty of China over her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own domain is not recognized; he who is strong enough may take what he pleases, and his neighbor, lest the balance of power be broken, may go and do the same. That under such circumstances the wrath of the people is aroused is no matter for wonder. The West cannot sow the wind in the East without having later to meet the terrible necessity of reaping the whirlwind.

I have tried to give a fair analysis of the causes of the anti-foreign feeling which prevails in China. It is not complete; there are other causes which might be mentioned. But I have given those which are most important, those which concern us most. It must be evident, I think, after studying them, that the antagonism of Chinese to foreigners is not altogether groundless; that foreigners themselves have had a large share in creating it. I trust that when the present fierce uprising is put down, when peace is restored to the distracted Empire, and the time for the settlement of claims has come, this painful fact will not be forgotten.

GEORGE B. SMYTH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE JAPANESE VIEW OF THE SITUATION IN CHINA.

BY A JAPANESE DIPLOMAT.

In view of the grave situation in China, which is growing daily more serious, it may not be superfluous to lay before the reading public an opinion regarding the problem from the Japanese point of view.

The present Chinese question, with which nearly all the great Powers are confronted, is not only a question of international politics, but it is also one of the most important social problems in the world. From what we can gather in regard to the motive of the so-called Boxers' rising, it seems that the object they had in view was originally a secret conspiracy directed against the Christian element in their country. Whether the rising was originally encouraged by any influence in the Imperial Court or among the administrative officials is not at all clear. I am rather inclined to think that the disturbance is the outbreak of a popular feeling of dissatisfaction, which has been gradually increasing, against foreigners among all classes of the Chinese, as the result of friction between Occidental and Oriental elements in the vast Empire of China.

In China, as in other countries in the Far East, foreigners and Christians are almost always put on the same level. A great number of foreigners are European or American missionaries, and practically the entire foreign population is Christian. The good work that has been done in China by these exponents of the Gospel cannot be disputed, but the lower grades of the populace, even when they have received a little education, do not always consider the bright and beneficial side of the missionary work. They often misunderstand the real object of the missionaries, who are in many instances looked upon as the pioneers of the "aggressive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreign devils." Frequently their hereditary notion about religion is hurt by the teachings of the Gospel which are by no means consistent with the popular conception of religion. Besides, the indescribable difficulties of acquiring the national language cause the missionaries to be easily misunderstood by the people. There is no doubt that there have been a great many converts among the Chinese, but at the same time the susceptibilities of a large portion of the population have been hurt by the work of the missionaries.

Fault may be found with the missionaries for the way in which they carry out their work, but the magnitude of the difficulties they have to contend with, in the execution of their task, is beyond dispute.

The anti-Christian movement has thus been engendered; but, as I have already mentioned, "anti-Christian" means practically "anti-foreign." Thus the first anti-Christian movement began to be directed against foreigners on an immense scale. The first symptom of the anti-foreign rising was to be observed in the month of April last. I often hear sceptical people say that a certain Power is acting behind the Chinese Court, and that that Power, through the influence of the Court, had encouraged the movement so that an opportunity might arise of which it wished to take advantage. However, so far as my knowledge of the question goes, there is absolutely nothing to warrant this supposition.

The rising is, therefore, more of a social than of a political character. I think I am fairly right when I say that the leaders of the "I-Ho-Chuan" consider it their duty to their country to rid China of the Christians aid consequently of all foreigners.

Moreover, the recent demands for "lease" of their "sphere of influence" by several Powers, and the subsequent grant of these demands by the Chinese Government, gave a splendid pretext for this anti-foreign movement. This establishment of foreign Powers within the Chinese Empire, under the name of "spheres of influence," together with the popular imagination that the missionaries are the pioneers of the "aggressive foreign devils," went a long way to show the Chinese that the expulsion of foreigners from the shores of the Middle Kingdom was a highly patriotic deed to accomplish.

Besides being of a social character, the movement thus assumed the color of a political problem. In this connection I may further mention that there is also a large portion of the people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who are not at all satisfied with being governed by the present Manchu dynasty. Although it is not wholly consistent with the progress of the movement as it has been made known to the public so far, I am almost certain that these malcontents have joined hands with the rebels. It seems to me very likely that for the present they are playing the game together with the "Boxers" under the patriotic pretext of expelling the "enemies of the country," in the hope that some day there might arise a chance for them to turn against the present ruling dynasty. There are not always wanting shrewd opportunists ready to fish in troubled waters. Still, for the purpose of this article, this supposition may be put aside.

It would be a great injustice to the Chinese were one to assume that the mistaken idea of patriots of expelling foreigners is also shared by the enlightened portion of the population; but, at all events, it seems almost certain, to the great regret of the civilized world, that the "Boxer" movement is backed by the Imperial Court and also by the actual government, the principal members of which have recently been replaced by the bigoted Conservatives, notorious for their anti-foreign feeling. Although I am far from saying that there exists a state of war between China on the one hand and the great Powers on the other, the progress of events indicates that the Chinese authorities are defying the strength of the Powers, and that they are determined to expel the "foreign invaders." Instances in proof of this are not wanting. The Chinese regular troops resisted by force the advance of the allied forces, and it has been reported that a secret edict of the Empress Dowager ordered the dispatch of the Tientsin garrison to Taku to check the landing of the foreign troops. Whatever may be the attitude of the Peking Government toward the "Boxer" movement, the fact remains that they are entirely incapable of suppressing the disturbances, if they do not actually encourage them.

The Powers whose interests are threatened cannot remain mere lookers-on. Their representatives at Peking and their subjects are threatened with wholesale massacre. Their commerce is brought to a complete standstill. And all these regrettable incidents are to a very great extent due to ignorance of the outer world on the part of the Chinese. They must, therefore, be enlightened, they must be educated, and they must be punished for their ignorance and folly. The duty of enlightening a population of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

400,000,000 souls rests entirely with the governments of the Powers concerned. The work is that of civilization, and that is why I described this question as one of the most momentous social problems in the world.

Ignorance must be swept away and the mischief punished, but to attain the object in view a certain amount of force must be employed. What would be the requisite amount of force largely depends upon the future progress of the disturbances. Supposing that the people of North China were to join hands with those of the South, then it would mean a tremendous war, a war against an immense and ancient Empire, with its population of some 400,000,000 souls, who would fly to arms to the cry of "Expulsion of all foreigners."

At the commencement of the present crisis it was hoped that the rising might be localized, but now it is too late, and there is a fear that the above supposition may be realized.

In addition to the difficulty of suppressing the disturbances, more difficult questions will arise after the "Boxers" have been reduced to submission. It is certain that these questions will sooner or later be submitted for solution. What, then, will those questions be? In the first place, there will be the problem about the future relations of China with the other Powers. The question in regard to the reorganization of the naval and military system will be another important point. A guarantee against the recurrence of such events as the present disturbance will surely be demanded by the Powers. Compensation for the damage done by the mobs to the lives and properties of the different Powers must also be settled. These will be the immediate questions that will follow the suppression of the present disturbances; and beyond that no one knows what will be the probable outcome of the "Chinese Crisis."

In dealing with these questions, let us first consider the ultimate objects which the Powers are making strenuous efforts to attain. China, with its already immense and still rapidly increasing population, affords to the whole world the most promising market for the future. The soil is generally fertile and the climate salubrious. Owing to the extremely conservative character of the people, they have persistently opposed the introduction of modern appliances of civilization, and the result is that they are uneducated and the resources of the country are undeveloped. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is sad to see a vast Empire like China remaining far behind other countries in the way of national development. This fact is a great misfortune to China, first of all, and to the world at large it is a source of extreme danger, and this danger has now actually arisen.

In the history of the world there was a time when events were actuated by human sentiment, chiefly by differences of race and of religion. But nowadays diplomacy is entirely guided by material interests, and there is a growing tendency to allow commercial interests to play the first part in influencing diplomacy. In the days when almost all the nations of the world were governed by all powerful monarchs, international questions, as well as internal affairs, were frequently influenced by the mere caprice of the rulers. But those ages of despotism have passed away, and in the present generation public opinion or the voice of the people governs everything. Then, what is public opinion? It is nothing short of the manifestation of public and national interests. If this statement is correct, and if national politics are governed by the national interests of the country, international problems must also be mainly influenced by the material interests of each of the nations concerned, and not only by their sentiments. I make especial mention of this because the present Chinese question concerns several countries of different races and religions, and also because the question should not be treated from the religious and racial point of view. The question is one of humanity and affects the interest of almost all the great Powers on the face of the globe. Of all the material interests of a nation, the commercial is the most important. The age of agriculture is gone by, and in the present age commerce is in its prime, backed by various branches of industry; this is the commercial era, and the aim of every country is directed toward the development of its commerce. Development of commerce means progress of civilization, and commerce must go hand in hand with peace.

China is a great commercial country; or, at least, the Chinese have a splendid capacity for becoming the ablest merchants in the world. Chinese merchants have an immense trading capital at their disposal; their commercial institutions and banking systems are perfect; and, above all, their honesty, which is the best policy in commerce, is indisputable. These remarks may appear rather strange to the public, but persons who know the Chinese well are agreed on these points. The social condition of China is, perhaps,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of the most mysterious phenomena in the world. It is almost hopeless for "Outlanders" to understand thoroughly the manners and customs of China. Before one can speak Chinese, a person must learn by heart a vast number of complicated Chinese characters, to acquire which the whole of a man's life would hardly suffice. Even foreign merchants who have lived in that country a number of years are obliged to have recourse to Chinese interpreters or the "Compradors;" there are very few foreign merchants who really understand the business transactions carried on among the Chinese. As it is necessary to educate and enlighten the general Chinese public, to maintain peace and order among them, it is also desirable that outsiders should have a more familiar acquaintance with China. I said that China is a commercial nation, but this remark needs some explanation. Although in China it appears that the gap between the upper and lower classes is great, and that there are several castes of people, there is practically no priviliged class, and the whole people stand on the same footing. Individualism and equality among the people are most remarkable. With the exception of the officials, the people belong to either of three classes, the farmers, the artisans and the merchants. But the number of farmers is very limited; the artisans are not prosperous, industry not having been at all developed; and therefore the only ruling class is that of the merchants. The desire of accumulating wealth by carrying on trade is thus the general sentiment of the people. As a rule, the Chinese are extremely wealthy, the riches accumulated by generations having reached an enormous aggregate; and this is proved by the fact that the merchants derive their capital from the investments of Chinese high officials and the numerous millionaires throughout the country. The consequence is that the purchasing power of the country is well nigh unlimited. A country such as China, with a population of 400,000,000 wealthy inhabitants, and with the fully developed intermediary of honest merchants as hitherto set forth, affords to the world a market as attractive as can be desired.

Should the commercial interest be the most important of all international interests, as I have already argued, there is only one course to be pursued in regard to the settlement of the present Chinese question, and that is the policy of maintaining the independence and integrity of the Chinese Empire with its door wholly open to the commerce of the world. Opinions have often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been expressed to the effect that China is doomed to lose its independence sooner or later. People, it is said, in that Empire are not fit to govern themselves, and if they were left to manage their internal affairs the whole country would become the hotbed of all sorts of dangers threatening the progress of the civilization of the world. Therefore, the country must either be placed under the protectorate or the *condominium* of the civilized Powers.

Let us ask ourselves if this proposal of placing the Chinese Empire under the protectorate of several Powers would be a satisfactory settlement of the Far Eastern question. Although the *condominium* or the protectorate principle has often been put into execution, it has never failed to prove that the protectorate system is only a temporary solution of the question, and that it invariably leads to a more difficult situation than before. Everybody's business is nobody's business, as the Irish car-driver said when a tourist asked him why a very unpopular landlord had never been shot at. The whole arrangement may easily collapse into a deplorable condition of negligence. Or, on the contrary, it is more probable that it may lead to the ascendency of one particular Power that might dare to push itself forward in defiance of any remonstrances from the others. This would certainly not be the arrangement we sincerely desire. Let us, then, suppose that China should be divided among the Powers. If one supposed for a moment that any Power would be able to govern easily its own acquired territory, one would be greatly in error. Besides the difficulty in understanding the language, the manners and customs of the people, as already stated, there would arise numberless unexpected troubles.

There is one very clear instance of the difficulty of governing the Chinese. It is our own experience in the Island of Formosa. This island was ceded to Japan by the Chinese Government after the recent war between the two countries. It is now five years since we acquired this island; but constant disturbances have arisen there, caused by the native rebels, in spite of the strenuous efforts made by the Japanese Government toward the restoration of order and peace in that island. It may be remarked that the Japanese are not good colonisers, but at the same time they are in a better position than any other nation for knowing and understanding the Chinese. And the natives of Formosa are not better fighters than the Chinese on the opposite mainland. The state

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of things in Cuba also tends to show that to govern a conquered people is no easy task. Even if we took it for granted that these difficulties could be easily surmounted, the partition of China would produce numerous other undesirable results. Each Power, when once it became the actual master of its respective sphere of influence, would naturally rule its territory according to its own ideas. By this means China would be divided into a group of different countries, with their own laws, their own different administrations, the preferential rates of customs duties on imported merchandise, etc. The whole Empire would become the scene of violent rivalries and competition. That would be a state of war under the mask of peace. This is by no means a desirable solution of the problem.

If we seriously consider the extreme difficulty with which the Powers are at present confronted, and also the inconceivable sacrifice of blood and treasure that might possibly be required to carry out the proposed partition of China, even the strongest Power in the world would shrink from inaugurating the daring policy of the dismemberment of that immense Empire. Even after the continuous victories of the Japanese army in the recent war with China, they would never have dared to enter Peking unless they were 100,000 strong. This single instance will suffice to show the difficulty of confronting a determined foe. When the whole population of China, deeply imbued with the utmost hatred of foreigners, once stood determined to uphold their country against foreign aggression, even the largest available forces that the Powers might bring together would hardly be able to cope with the crisis.

These difficulties are clearly understood by the German Emperor. His Majesty, addressing the men of the First and Second Battalions of Marines, on the eve of their departure for China, said:

> "You will meet a foe who is not less valiant than yourselves. Trained by European officers, the Chinese have learned to use European weapons."

Thus the protectorate arrangement is not satisfactory, and the partition of the Empire would not improve the situation. Then the only remaining policy is that of maintaining the independence and integrity of China. The policy of the Open Door in China was originated by England, and Lord Salisbury has repeatedly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

declared in Parliament that Her Majesty's Government covets no territorial expansion in China. The United States of America, indorsing this policy of the British Government, went further than that; and in September, 1899, they proposed that the Powers should make a declaration guaranteeing the freedom of trade in China. In order to explain the views of the United States Government on this subject, I quote here a few paragraphs from the official dispatch, bearing date of September 22, 1899, addressed to Lord Salisbury by the Honorable Joseph Choate, the American Ambassador to Great Britain. He says:

"He (the President of the United States) understands it to be the settled policy and purpose of Great Britain not to use any privileges which may be granted to it in China as a means of excluding any commercial rivals, and that freedom of trade for it in the Empire means freedom of trade for all the world alike. Her Majesty's Government, while conceding by formal agreement with Germany and Russia the possession of spheres of influence or interest in China, in which they are to enjoy special rights and privileges, particularly in respect to railroads and mining enterprises, has, at the same time, sought to maintain what is commonly called 'the Open Door policy' to secure to the commerce and navigation of all nations equality of treatment within such spheres. The maintenance of this policy is alike urgently demanded by the commercial communities of our two nations, as it is justly held by them to be the only one which will improve existing conditions, enable them to maintain their positions in the markets of China and extend their future operations."

Touching on the subject of the maintenance of the integrity of China, Mr. Choate goes on to say:

"It is the sincere desire of my Government that the interests of its citizens may not be prejudiced through exclusive treatment by any of the controlling Powers within their respective 'spheres of interest' in China, and it hopes to retain there an open market for all the world's commerce, remove dangerous sources of international irritation and thereby hasten united action of the powers at Peking to promote administrative reforms, so greatly needed for strengthening the Imperial Government and maintaining the integrity of China, in which it believes the whole Western world is alike concerned. It believes that such a result may be greatly aided and advanced by declarations by the various powers claiming 'spheres of interest' in China as to their intentions in regard to the treatment of foreign trade and commerce therein, and that the present is a very favorable moment for informing Her Majesty's Government of the desire of the United States to have it made on its own part."

After stating the reasons why the United States Government believes that both Russia and Germany will co-operate in such an understanding as is there proposed, the dispatch further says:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It is needless also to add that Japan, the power most largely interested in the trade of China, must be in entire sympathy with the views here expressed and that its interests will be largely served by the proposed arrangements, and the declarations of its statesmen within the last year are so entirely in line with it, that the co-operation of that power is confidently relied upon."

The attitude of the two great Powers which have the largest share of interests in China is thus to maintain the integrity of the Empire and the policy of the "Open Door" in that country.

The peaceful policy of Russia needs little explanation. The Emperor's earnest desire for peace was shown to the whole world by his recent manifesto calling together the Peace Conference at The Hague. It is also clear that the policy of France cannot be otherwise than on the same lines as that of the other Powers. In the French Chamber, on the 3d of July, M. Delcassé, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, put forth the views entertained by his Government on the present question. He is reported to have made the following declaration:

"The Chamber will remember that during the past two years I have repeatedly stated that France, as mistress of Indo-China, has no interest in provoking or desiring the break up of China, which is perhaps without sufficient reflection spoken of. What I can affirm is that France has no wish for war with China, but she cannot evade the duty of protecting her citizens and of obtaining for her merchants the guarantees obtained by others. It is for this and this alone that the Government has taken the measures necessitating a credit of 3,350,000 francs for the Chinese expedition. France is certainly anxious for the maintenance of the equilibrium in the Far East."

Germany stands also on the same lines, and this has been solemnly declared by no less a person than the German Emperor in his emphatic speech at Wilhelmshaven. His Majesty said:

"The Russians, the English, the French, or whoever they may be, they are all fighting for the same cause—which is that of civilization."

In dealing with the Chinese it is most important to show them that the Powers are acting in full concert, and that they are absolutely determined to carry out their work of suppressing the rebels, and also that they have no aggressive intention as to territory, unless they are forced by dire necessity to protect their respective interests.

A JAPANESE DIPLOMAT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GATHERING OF THE STORM IN CHINA.

BY ROBERT E. LEWIS.

CHINA is not a savage land, her people are not barbarians. Her hoary civilzation, however, has rusted out, for civil order is a *sine qua non* in a self-governing, self-respecting State. It is my purpose to deal with lawless occurrences which have taken place in various parts of China during the last two years; which are matters of record, and about which there is no doubt or exaggeration. It might be concluded from these occurrences that all foreigners in China have been in imminent peril. But, in point of fact, the vast majority of merchants and missionaries, whether in port cities or in the interior, have been undisturbed in their rights. Nevertheless, it is also clear from the facts that no one knows when mob violence will stop at his door.

Lord Charles Beresford told us when here, and has since written down, the revelations of incapacity and supineness made to him by the high officials of China. Though this supineness has long been painfully apparent, yet no such official acknowledgment of it has ever before come to light. It shocks one to know that the Prince-President of the Tsung-li-Yamen, the Viceroys ruling Keang-su, An-hui, Keang-se, Hoo-pih, Hunan, Fuh-keen and Sze-chuen provinces, and others, admit their inability to protect foreigners or foreign interests in China. Lord Beresford was led to the conclusion that "there is no real security for commerce throughout the whole of China."

The outrages have not been directed against any one class of foreigners. Arson and murderous assault have been indiscriminately perpetrated upon diplomatists, consuls, missionaries, scientists, customs officers, and business men. Roman Catholic priests and convents, however, have been rather more often the victims of the malice of the people. In travelling in all parts of China many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these outrages on foreigners have been personally investigated by the writer.

At Shasi, in Hoo-pih province above Hankow, mobs sacked and burned the imperial customs house and residence, the Japanese Consulate, a mercantile stores-ship, and the Swedish mission. The foreigners escaped in boats on the Yangtsze. The riot was, apparently, premeditated and carefully planned. On the same night, four hundred miles from Shasi, placards having called for the expulsion of the "foreign dogs," and the officials doing nothing to prevent outrage, the missionaries escaped from the mobs which held both the roads, and drifted away in a rowboat.

Near Peking, the chief engineer of the Imperial Railway, an officer of the British Legation, and a major of the English army, while inspecting a portion of the new railway, were attacked by Chinese soldiers, badly bruised, and left in a bleeding condition. Soldiers also attacked Mr. Dunston's house, and, killing one servant, looted the place. At Mentze, in Yun-nan, the French consulate was recently plundered, and the imperial customs burned to the ground.

The province of Sze-chuen was, in 1899, for months in a state of anarchy, and the officials in a state of innocuous desuetude. The rebellion of 8,000 men, headed by Yu-Man-tze, had for its express purpose the driving out of the foreign "dogs and goats." The brigands attempted to extirpate the Christians of the province. Father Fleury was captured by Yu-Man-tze, and, during the eight months of his captivity, was carried from place to place, and wherever Christians were found Yu had them brought before Father Fleury and murdered at his feet. Such instances as the following have been the order of the day in Sze-chuen. At Shun-ching, the mission house was torn to pieces, the mission buildings razed to the ground, the missionary hunted for his life. At Hopao-chang, the mission was looted, the chapel burned, two priests captured, two servants killed, one Christian family plundered. At Ho-chow, the buildings of the mission were burned; at Kwei-fu the mission ruined. The city of Keang-peh is across the river from the open port of Chung-king. A new dispensary had been opened, and two Chinese medical students were temporarily in charge of it. The place was looted and one student was killed. "The powerlessness of the mandarins at such a crisis is really astonishing, and one is forced to ask if they are just as powerless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as they appear to be." Lord Charles Beresford was told that Yu and his followers had burned four thousand houses and thirty chapels; that over 20,000 Catholics had been set adrift, and property destroyed to the extent of $4,150,000. This amount is undoubtedly over-stated, however.

An example of what such a state of affairs has meant to the individual may be seen in the case of Mr. Parsons, of the Church Missionary Society. He left Chun-king to go back to his post at Pao-ning, with an escort of four soldiers. In crossing a river in a ferryboat, he saw a body of troops on the opposite bank. They raised the cry, "Kill the foreigner." When the boat reached the bank his escort fled, and the boat was overwhelmed by soldiers belonging to Yu-Man-tze. Mr. Parsons was attacked with swords and knives, and, though he could swim but little, he threw himself into the river. Catching at a floating bamboo, he kept his head above water, and drifted with the stream, while the soldiers followed in a boat, prodding at him in the water. At length he got on board of a Chinese gunboat and was saved. But the officers and men of the gunboat showed no opposition to the rebels or their murderous assault, and did everything short of violence to keep him from getting on the boat.

Passing from Sze-chuen to Kwei-chow province, we must refer to the murder, on the public highway, of Mr. Fleming, of the China Inland Mission, and of the Chinese evangelist who was with him. "The evidence received from Kuei-yang proves that the murder was deliberately planned by the gentry and officials," and yet the demand of the British Minister at Peking that the governor of the province be degraded, was flouted. At the city of Pao-ching-fu in Hunan, last September, a missionary called at the prefect's Yamen. A mob of between four and five thousand men assembled and demanded the foreigner. He escaped at the rear in a boat. But the mob, in their attempt to get him, pulled down the first buildings of the Yamen's court. Penetrating to the inner court with lighted torches, they fired the great edifice of two hundred rooms, and plundered the chests in the treasury of $14,000.

In the north of An-hui, Ho-nan, and Keang-su provinces, there has been a serious armed rebellion. The walled cities of Shu-chou, Meng-cheng, Meao-erchi, and Ku-yang were besieged and fell. Niu, the leader, butchered about two thousand men, women and children at the capture of Ku-yang. The city gates of Hsu-chou

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were "decorated with several hundred queues and scalps"—the Red Indian style of civilization! It is believed that over 50,000 people lost their lives in this rebellion, which was in the Yangtsze basin, as was also the one in Sze-chuen. In An-hui province, Mr. Cook, manager of the Pochishan coal mines, had trying times. Two hundred natives tried to hang him, and, failing in that, to throw him down the shaft of the mine. After a desperate struggle he escaped.

The working of silver mines near Ningpo has been fraught with danger. The Fenghua magistrate decided to settle matters with the town of Sun-gao. The result was that his soldiers were disarmed and imprisoned by the townsmen, the official himself was nearly stripped of his clothing, and his official chair was added to a bonfire. The foreigner in charge of the mine fled to the country. The course of the miner in China is a turbulent one.

The province of Shan-tung has been much disturbed during the year. Missions were burned, the houses of Christians pillaged, the Christians were harried, persecuted and murdered. Three Germans, officers and gentlemen, were murderously set upon by an unprovoked mob, and they saved themselves only after shooting down some of the rioters. Foreigners in the midst of this upheaval wrote: "The local officials are powerless to punish the offenders." "There is practically no guarantee for the safety of the lives and property of foreigners residing in the interior of China." This state of affairs resulted in German troops seizing and occupying a walled city or two, a hundred miles from the coast of Shan-tung. Their treatment of the Chinese was drastic but salutary, and as a result, order is being restored.

Still another open rebellion—this one in Southern China—has been quieted with difficulty. In Kuang-se province, about 7,000 men were in arms. The cities of Yung-hsieu and Peilin were "pillaged and dismantled," and many other places were laid low. The proclamation of one Chang is significant of the objective of this rebellion: "I, Chang, obeying the orders of Heaven to gather all the braves and heroes together, with a special view to seek revenge for the people, to drive away the foreign devils, and to protect China, have assembled over 300 philosophical scholars, about 3,000 military officers, and more than 30,000 brave soldiers." And a whole province in South China was under their sway for several months.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Turning from Southern China, I must refer to the region on the Yangtsze of which I-chang is the port city. Here rioting was mostly directed against the Catholic Christians. Chapels were burned, Christians robbed and their lands wrested from them. One priest, followed by 1,000 converts, travelled to I-chang for safety. The bandits had this legend on their banners: "Destroy the foreigner and advance the dynasty." They meant what they said, as the story of young, accomplished Father Victorian shows. This Belgian priest was located about 100 miles from I-chang. The bandits wrecked the mission, murdered the Christians, captured Victorian and hung him to a tree. "As this poor man hung from the tree to which he was tied, pieces were cut from his thighs and eaten by his tormentors. . . . Finally his body was cut open, from the chest to the bottom of the abdomen; he was disembowelled, and the various organs were taken out and eaten by these semi-civilized people, who at the same time drank his blood. He was also mutilated in a way that cannot be described, and his head was cut off." This was penned by a person at I-chang who saw Victorian's body.

And, later on, comes the premeditated assault on the missionaries of the Church Missionary Society at Kien-ning, in Fuh-keen province, near where the massacre occurred a few years ago. At Kien-ning the mob destroyed the church, the mission house, the dispensary, the leper asylum, looted the hospital, and beat the brains out of an aged Christian, throwing another Christian into a well. The officials gave Dr. Rigg and his associates no protection whatever, though the city had been placarded for several days to the effect that the foreigners were to be killed. Following the attack on the mission, bills were freely posted, in the name of the *literati,* calling on the people to "rise and kill every foreigner," and urging that the native Christians should be "hunted down like wild beasts or highway robbers, and rooted out until not one remains."

We return again to the consideration of the situation in North China. United States Minister Conger told me, a few months ago, that he was really apprehensive for the safety of Americans in Shan-tung and Chi-li. Since that time, the Righteous Harmony Fists have extended their organization, large numbers of soldiers and others have joined their ranks. The whole Manchu military force in Northern China is said to be in sympathy with them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Rev. Mr. Brooks has been murdered, hundreds of Christians have had their houses burned, while many have been killed in cold blood; portions of the Lu-han and the Tientsin-Peking railways have been torn up, and marines have been landed from the available ships of war.

I have written enough, though not all. What are some of the deductions? (1.) The instances cited have occurred in twelve out of the eighteen provinces of China; it is therefore not a local condition. (2.) These attacks have been made on all classes of foreigners. Foreigners were to be killed or driven out. (3.) The missionaries suffer most, because, according to treaty, missionaries only have the right to reside in the interior. (4.) Of attacks on missionaries, two-thirds, or more, are directed against Roman Catholics.

The Treaty of Tientsin (article VIII.) says: "Persons teaching or professing it (the Christian religion), therefore, shall alike be entitled to the protection of the Chinese authorities; nor shall any such peaceably pursuing their calling, and not offending against the law, be persecuted or interfered with." Does it need more proof than has been adduced to show that this treaty protection is often without force? I know of no case of assault or pillage or murder where the Chinese authorities have lodged the claim that the foreigner thus maltreated had broken over his lawful rights. They confess negligence and attempt to make reparation, but that does not restore life? No missionary in China deserts his work for fear of outbreaks. Merchants do not look with favor on risks which are quadrupled and trade which is constantly disturbed. But the question which, we believe, deserves attention is this: What is to happen if civil order continues to become more chaotic, and the incompetence of the Chinese government is still more disgracefully shown? There are over one thousand missionaries in China. The American vested and business interests there are also great. Should there not be a clear national policy as to what America will, or will not, do to meet the catastrophe into which China is fast drifting? This is a question not of partition, but of civil and treaty rights. As long as China is treated as a "going concern," the line of operations is easily seen; but what is to happen when the government is recognized as a gone concern? That day seems to be approaching.

Shanghai, China, May, 1900. ROBERT E. LEWIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICA'S TREATMENT OF THE CHINESE.

BY CHARLES F. HOLDER.

A DISTINGUISHED French diplomat recently said: "America is not the disinterested figure generally supposed. She will be forced to take sides in the partition of China if it comes, and will not submit to fill the mere office of a looker on in Venice. Moreover," continued the speaker, "the policy of America has been distinctly aggressive and anti-Chinese since 1868. The United States government has in every way outraged China, has broken its treaties time and again, and, if the history of these wrongs were written it would show that China has had reason for a declaration of war against the government of the States time and again. I know not what you think; but to a European outsider the United States has for years carried a chip on its shoulder; and the assumption is that it would welcome a war with China, that the opportunity might afford an excuse to acquire a port or colony in China for its commercial aggrandisement."

There is hardly an American reader who will not laugh at this rodomontade, but, while it may seem a waste of time to prove the futility of such suspicions on the part of foreigners as to the purposes which have animated us in our dealings with China, it is interesting to glance at our treaty relations with China from the standpoint of an alien, and note how we have carried out our obligations, and what our treatment of China has actually been.

Our first treaty with China was negotiated by Caleb Cushing, who as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary went to China in 1844, bearing a letter to the Emperor from President Tyler. But four years before then, the British fleet had bombarded the ports which had been sealed for centuries; and as a result, five ports were open at the time of Mr. Cushing's mission, and Great Britain was in full possession of Hong Kong, which had been ceded in perpetuity by the helpless and impotent nation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Cushing had, in a large measure, discretionary powers, and after assuring the Emperor that America was not in sympathy with the attitude of Great Britain in seizing Hong Kong, he negotiated the Treaty of Wang Hiya, which constitutes the first act of official intercourse this country has had with China.

This treaty, which has always been of great benefit to us, gave Americans the right of residence at the treaty ports. This was considered by the Chinese a remarkable concession, and Mr. Cushing was given to understand that it was granted in appreciation of the friendly attitude of America, though it was a self-evident fact that Americans could not have been kept out. The treaty did not end here. By it, Americans obtained extra-territorial privileges which, among other things, gave them the right to be tried in their consular courts. Mr. Cushing also secured the insertion of what is known as the "most favored nation clause," which placed American citizens on a par with the citizens of other nations.

These were the first concessions obtained from the Chinese, the first clouds on the Celestial horizon suggestive of their ultimate undoing; the door once open, the cupidity of the entire commercial world was aroused. The concession of Hong Kong to Great Britain was but a sop thrown to delay the inevitable; and seventeen years after the opening of the doors of China we find England and France allied for the purpose of prying open the Chinese oyster still wider.

The attitude of America at that juncture is a matter of history, and it was commendable from a diplomatic and humanitarian point of view. We were invited by the Powers interested to make common cause with them against China, but we declined and sent a special envoy, in the person of W. B. Reed, to inform the Emperor that we were not in sympathy with the action of the Powers. Our position was criticised by England, whose wits expressed the opinion that America declined to join in the war, as a matter of economy, but sent a fleet up the Peiho in the wake of the ships of France and England, and secured all the commercial benefits without a corresponding expense.

This was, to a certain extent, true; as, after this war, we obtained our second treaty with China, while England and France paid the expense; their combined fleets forcing open six new ports, and our envoy, Mr. Reed, obtaining with them the right of trade and residence. This treaty begins as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"There shall be, as there always has been, peace between the United States of America and the Ta-Tsing Empire and between their people, respectively. They shall not insult or oppress each other for any trifling cause, so as to produce an estrangement between them."

This was, surely, a gentle satire on future events, as Americans have undoubtedly treated the Chinese in America with studied disrespect. The Chinese have retaliated by making this country the dumping ground of their criminals, the great seat of their slave trade, and in many directions have dispossessed the American laborer.

The third treaty with China was consummated by Anson Burlingame, who was Minister to China in 1863; a compact which was at the root of all the labor troubles on the Pacific coast, and which dominated politics about the Golden Gate for three decades. At this time Senator Stanford, Mr. Huntington and other railroad men were figuring on the Pacific Railroad and needed cheap labor to accomplish it. Mr. Burlingame was requested to say to the Ta-Tsing government that America would welcome Chinese emigrants in unlimited numbers. Previous to this there was an unwritten law in the Orient that no Chinaman should leave his country, but the invitation of America brought about a change. The Ta-Tsing government recognized an opportunity to reduce its surplus paupers and criminals, and a treaty was readily agreed upon. It began as follows, and it is interesting reading in the light of later events:

"The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance; and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects, respectively, from the one country to the other for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents."

At the invitation of our government the Chinese poured into this country in a human river, whose flow never flagged, and in 1867 the Chinese population of the Pacific slope was formidable and portentous. A cry went up, American labor sounded the alarm, and the abrogation of the famous Burlingame treaty was demanded. While attempts were being made in this direction, the hoodlum element of San Francisco determined to take time by the forelock and Chinamen by the queue, and what was known as the "sand-lot agitation," a protest against the third treaty, was begun. So intense was the excitement that the government was obliged to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interfere, and a special embassy, composed of James B. Angell, W. H. Trescott and John F. Swift, was appointed by President Hayes and sent to Peking to request a modification of the treaty, which a decade before Mr. Burlingame had used every device known to the skilled diplomat to obtain. Under some circumstances it would have been humiliating to the national pride, but the Pacific coast was aflame. Law and order were crushed under foot, and it was manifestly impossible to protect Chinamen in America; hence the modification of the treaty was demanded and received.

The modified treaty is of interest at this time in its bearing upon the Hawaiian Islands, now a territory of the United States. The first article reads:

"Whenever, in the opinion of the United States, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of that country, or of any locality within the territory thereof, the government of China agrees that the government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it."

The result of this treaty was the nominal stoppage of Chinese immigration, with the favored nation clause included, a feature which had constituted the essence of one of our early treaties. Up to this time China and the United States had been on terms of cordiality, but the new treaty did not satisfy the anti-Chinese party on the Pacific coast, and a series of outrages was begun, which, to the unprejudiced observer, suggest that the criticism of the French diplomat is not without reason, and that we have not observed the spirit of our treaties with China. In truth, for purely local political reasons certain rights of the Chinese have not been respected. Difficulties began to accumulate in 1882, when Congress took action on the Angell treaty, and passed an act, the first section of which states:

"That from and after the expiration of ninety days after the passage of this Act, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States be, and the same is, hereby suspended for ten years; and during such suspension it shall not be lawful for any Chinese laborers to come, or having so come after the expiration of ninety days, to remain within the United States."

The first effect of this was noticed in China, where the Chinese began to retaliate against Americans, many of whom were obliged to take refuge in consulates, and a general uprising against for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eigners was threatened. The records show that three years after the Chinese Restriction Act was put in force, 40,222 Chinese had returned to China, and but 18,704 had entered the United States. To illustrate the feeling at this time, it is told by a school teacher in a primary school in San Francisco, that the children having bought an American flag with their money, she asked them to select some sentiment to work upon it. One little boy raised his hand, and on being asked what he would inscribe on the flag, replied: "The Chinese must go." Such was the sentiment when even children were taught to hoot at and hurl stones at Chinamen.

In the election of 1888 each political party on the Pacific coast made the sentiment of this child its party cry. It was a local issue, but was soon made a national question by the astute leaders, who knew that by obtaining anti-Chinese legislation in Congress the party on the Coast would be aided. So a new treaty was prepared and submitted to the Chinese Minister and his government, then amended in the Senate, and finally, that it might not be too late for its intended effect upon the voters, the Democratic party in the House forced what is known as the "Scott Exclusion Act" through Congress, and it was signed by President Cleveland. In truth, so far as our former treaties were concerned, and looking at it from a non-partisan point of view, it was an outrage upon the proprieties, a gratuitous insult to a great yet defenseless nation. The act completely demoralized the Chinese in this country, which was the intention. By it twenty thousand certificates were declared null and void, twenty thousand promises, on the honor of the United States, that the holders should be allowed to return, were ruthlessly broken; and, to satisfy the clamor of irresponsible bands of hoodlums led by sand-lot politicians in San Francisco, the whole machinery of the government was prostituted that votes might be secured, and the act was passed by Congress while the treaty was pending. The action was so gross that it called forth criticism from the English press, and William M. Evarts voiced his indignation in a public address, saying that "it was the first time in the diplomatic history of this country of an intervention by legislative action while there was a treaty, negotiated by this government, pending for adoption by a foreign country." The incident was considered an insult by all the Powers, who professed to believe at the time, and with apparent reason, that we were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trying to provoke war as an excuse for taking a hand in managing the affairs of China. That Mr. Sherman resented the indignity thrust upon Americans is shown in the following utterance of his: "If Great Britain were to act thus toward the American people, he would not hesitate to vote either for the declaration of non-intercourse or war." Yet there was no hidden aggressive policy in the act. It was merely a vagary of what is known as American politics, where local politicians have the power, through Senators and Representatives, to force action and interfere in the diplomatic affairs of the Department of State. In a word, the political leaders of the Pacific coast succeeded in committing the entire government to an act that was a gross violation of the supplemental treaty of 1880.

It is not surprising, then, that the Great Powers affected to believe that the United States had ulterior motives.

It is interesting to note the dignified protest from the Chinese Minister at this last outrage. He said, in a letter to Mr. Blaine:

> "In my country we have acted upon the conviction that, where two nations deliberately and solemnly enter upon treaty stipulations, they thereby form a sacred compact from which they could not be honorably discharged, except through friendly negotiations and a new agreement. I was, therefore, not prepared to learn through the medium of that great tribunal (the Supreme Court) that there was a way recognized in the law and practice of this country whereby your government could release itself from treaty obligations without consultation with or consent of the other party to what we had been accustomed to regard as a sacred instrument."

It was a difficult matter for our astute and diplomatic Secretary to reply to this and other letters and protests, and still preserve the dignity of this country intact. Indeed, in some instances the Department of State was the laughing stock of Europe, notably in the case of the Denver riots. Chinamen had been shot down without cause, and a strong protest was made by the Chinese Minister, who, referring to the treaty, demanded that the guilty parties should be brought to justice, pointing out that in China such attacks against American citizens resulted in the beheading of the guilty parties. Mr. Evarts had but one reply to make, and it was that, under the Constitution, "Federal authorities could not interfere with the municipal affairs of a State; hence the United States government was not responsible," ending by referring the Minister to the Governor of Colorado.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was a confession of weakness, and it was commented upon by the British and German press, while the reply of the Chinese Minister made all Europe smile. His reply was that the Chinese government had no treaties with Colorado, hence did not look to that State for justice. In the terse epigrammatic diction of the day, there was but one thing for Mr. Evarts to do, and, as a Democratic paper said, he "sawed wood," and the Denver affair, so far as compensation is concerned, still hangs fire.

What those who affected to believe that America was following out a well-defined policy of aggression called a "long line of abuses" followed, the chief of which was the Geary bill, a result of Pacific coast clamor, which was intended to bundle out the Chinese faster, and its form and various clauses brought many protests from the Chinese Minister, which, it is needless to say, were unavailing. The Geary bill was an extremely harsh measure. It provided that Chinamen who were arrested must prove that they were here previous to the passage of the bill, or go to prison for a year, and then be deported. All Chinese laborers in the States were obliged to apply to the Internal Revenue Collector for a certificate of residence. When Chinamen landed and there was any question regarding their right, and a writ of *habeas corpus* had been applied for to get them ashore, no bail was accepted, and they were thrown into jail—a proceeding which, if applied to citizens of any of the great European powers, would have resulted in war.

CHARLES F. HOLDER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDUCATION WILL SOLVE THE RACE PROBLEM. A REPLY.

BY BOOKER T. WASHINGTON, PRESIDENT OF THE TUSKEGEE NORMAL AND INDUSTRIAL INSTITUTE, TUSKEGEE, ALABAMA.

"WILL Education Solve the Race Problem?" is the title of an interesting article in the June number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, by Professor John Roach Straton, of Macon, Georgia. My own belief is that education will finally solve the race problem. In giving some reasons for this faith, I wish to express my appreciation of the sincere and kindly spirit in which Professor Straton's article is written. I grant that much that he emphasizes as to present conditions is true. When we recall the past, these conditions could not be expected to be otherwise; but I see no reason for discouragement or loss of faith. When I speak of education as a solution for the race problem, I do not mean education in the narrow sense, but education which begins in the home and includes training in industry and in habits of thrift, as well as mental, moral and religious discipline, and the broader education which comes from contact with the public sentiment of the community in which one lives. Nor do I confine myself to the education of the negro. Many persons, in discussing the effect that education will have in working out the negro question, overlook the helpful influence that will ultimately come through the broader and more generous education of all the race elements of the South. As all classes of whites in the South become more generally educated in the broader sense, race prejudice will be tempered and they will assist in lifting up the black man.

In our desire to see a better condition of affairs, we are too often inclined to grow impatient because a whole race is not elevated in a short time, very much as a house is built. In all the history of mankind there have been few such radical, social and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic changes in the policy of a nation as have been effected within thirty-five years in this country, with respect to the change of four million and a half of slaves into four million and a half of freemen (now nearly ten million). When all the conditions of the past are considered, and compared with the present, I think the White South, the North and the Negro are to be congratulated on the fact that conditions are no worse, but are as encouraging as they are. The sudden change from slavery to freedom, from restraint to liberty, was a tremendous one; and the wonder is, not that the negro has not done better, but that he has done as well as he has. Every thoughtful student of the subject expected that the first two or three generations of freedom would lead to excesses and mistakes on the part of the negro, which would in many cases cause moral and physical degeneration, such as would seem to the superficial observer to indicate conditions that could not be overcome. It was to be anticipated that, in the first generation at least, the tendency would be, among a large number, to seek the shadow instead of the substance; to grasp after the mere signs of the highest civilization instead of the reality; to be led into the temptation of believing that they could secure, in a few years, that which it has taken other races thousands of years to obtain. Any one who has the daily opportunity of studying the negro at first hand cannot but gain the impression that there are indisputable evidences that the negro throughout the country is settling down to a hard, common sense view of life; that he is fast learning that a race, like an individual, must pay for everything it gets—the price of beginning at the bottom of the social scale and gradually working up by natural processes to the highest civilization. The exaggerated impressions that the first years of freedom naturally brought are giving way to an earnest, practical view of life and its responsibilities.

Let us take a broad, generous survey of the negro race as it came into the country, represented by twenty savages, in 1619, and trace its progress through slavery, through the Civil War period, and through freedom to the present moment. Who will be brave enough to say that the negro race, as a whole, has not increased in numbers and grown stronger mentally, morally, religiously, industrially, and in the accumulation of property? In a word, has not the negro, at every stage, shown a tendency to grow into harmony with the best type of American civilization?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Professor Straton lays special stress upon the moral weakness of the race. Perhaps the worst feature of slavery was that it prevented the development of a family life, with all of its far-reaching significance. Except in rare cases, the uncertainties of domicile made family life, during two hundred and fifty years of slavery, an impossibility. There is no institution so conducive to right and high habits of physical and moral life as the home. No race starting in absolute poverty could be expected, in the brief period of thirty-five years, to purchase homes and build up a family life and influence that would have a very marked impression upon the life of the masses. The negro has not had time enough to collect the broken and scattered members of his family. For the sake of illustration, and to employ a personal reference, I do not know who my own father was; I have no idea who my grandmother was; I have or had uncles, aunts and cousins, but I have no knowledge as to where most of them now are. My case will illustrate that of hundreds of thousands of black people in every part of our country. Perhaps those who direct attention to the negro's moral weakness, and compare his moral progress with that of the whites, do not consider the influence of the memories which cling about the old family homestead upon the character and aspirations of individuals. The very fact that the white boy is conscious that, if he fails in life, he will disgrace the whole family record, extending back through many generations, is of tremendous value in helping him to resist temptations. On the other hand, the fact that the individual has behind him and surrounding him proud family history and connections serves as a stimulus to make him overcome obstacles, when striving for success. All this should be taken into consideration, to say nothing of the physical, mental and moral training which individuals of the white race receive in their homes. We must not pass judgment upon the negro too soon. It requires centuries for the influence of home, school, church and public contact to permeate the mass of millions of people, so that the upward tendency may be apparent to the casual observer. It is too soon to decide what effect general education will have upon the rank and file of the negro race, because the masses have not been educated.

Throughout the South, especially in the Gulf States, the great bulk of the black population lives in the country districts. In these districts the schools are rarely in session more than three

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

months of the year. When this is considered, in connection with poor teachers, poor school-houses, and an almost entire lack of apparatus, it is obvious that we must wait longer before we can judge, even approximately, of the effect that general education will have upon the whole population. Most writers and speakers upon the subject of the negro's non-progressiveness base their arguments upon alleged facts and statistics of the life of negroes in the large cities. This is hardly fair. Before the Civil War the negro was not, to any considerable extent, a denizen of the large cities. Most of them lived on the plantations. The negro living in the cities has undergone two marked changes: (1.) the change from slavery to freedom; (2.) the change from country life to city life. At first the tendency of both these changes was, naturally, to unsettle, to intoxicate and to lead the negro to wrong ideas of life. The change from country life to city life, in the case of the white man, is about as marked as in the case of the negro. The average negro in the city, with all of its excitements and temptations, has not lived there more than half a generation. It is, therefore, too soon to reach a definite conclusion as to what the permanent effect of this life upon him will be. This, I think, explains the difference between the moral condition of the negro, to which Professor Straton refers, in the States where there has been little change in the old plantation life, as compared with that in the more northern of the Atlantic States, where the change from country to city life is more marked.

Judging from close observation, my belief is that, after the negro has overcome the false idea which city life emphasizes, two or three generations will bring about an earnestness and steadiness of purpose which do not now generally obtain. As the negro secures a home in the city, learns the lessons of industry and thrift and becomes a taxpayer, his moral life improves. The influence of home surroundings, of the school, the church and public sentiment will be more marked and have a more potent effect in causing him to withstand temptations. But, notwithstanding the shortness of the time which the negro has had in which to get schooled to his new life, any one who has visited the large cities of Europe will readily testify that the visible signs of immorality in those cities are far greater than among the colored people of America. Prostitution for gain is far more prevalent in the cities of Europe than among the colored people of our cities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Professor Straton says that the negro has degenerated in morals since he became free; in other words, that his condition in this respect is not as hopeful as it was during the early period of slavery. I do not think it wise to place too much reliance upon such a view of the matter, because there are too few facts upon which to base a comparison. The bald statement that the negro was not given to crime during slavery proves little. Slavery represented an unnatural condition of life, in which certain physical checks were kept constantly upon the individual. To say that the negro was at his best, morally, during the period of slavery is about the same as to say that the two thousand prisoners in the State prison and the city penal institutions in the city of Boston are the most righteous two thousand people in Boston. I question whether one can find two thousand persons in Boston who will equal these two thousand imprisoned criminals in the mere negative virtues. During the days of slavery the negro was rarely brought into the court to be tried for crime; hence, there was almost no public record of crimes committed by him. Each master, in most cases, punished his slave as he thought best, and as little as possible was said about it outside of his little plantation world. The improper relations between the sexes, with which the black race is now frequently charged in most sections of the South, were encouraged or winked at, under the slavery system, because of the financial value of the slaves. A custom that was fostered for three centuries cannot be blotted out in one generation.

In estimating the progress of a race, we should not consider alone the degree of success which has been actually attained, but also the obstacles which have been overcome in reaching that success. Judged by the obstacles overcome, few races, if any, in history have made progress commensurate with that of the colored people of the United States, in the same length of time. It may be conceded that the present generation of colored people does not compare favorably with the present generation of the white race, because of the reasons I have already given, and the further reason that on account of the black man's poverty of means to employ lawyers to have his case properly appealed to the higher courts, and his inability to furnish bonds, his criminal record is much worse than that of the white race, both in the Northern and Southern States. The Southern States, as a whole, have not yet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reached a point where they are able to provide reformatories for juvenile offenders, and consequently most of these are sent to the State prison, where the records show that the same individuals are often committed over and over again, because, in the first instance, the child prisoner, instead of being reformed, becomes simply hardened to prison life. In the North, it is true, the negro has the benefit of the reformatories; but the unreasonable prejudice which prevents him from securing employment in the shops and the factories more than offsets this advantage. Hundreds of negroes in the North become criminals who would become strong and useful men if they were not discriminated against as bread winners.

In the matter of assault upon white women, the negro is placed in a peculiar attitude. While this vile crime is always to be condemned in the strongest language, and should be followed by the severest legal punishment, yet the custom of lynching a negro when he is accused of committing such a crime calls the attention of the whole country to it, in such a way as is not always true in the case of a white man, North or South. Any one who reads the daily papers carefully knows that such assaults are constantly charged against white men in the North and in the South; but, because the white man, in most cases, is punished by the regular machinery of the courts, attention is seldom attracted to his crime outside of the immediate neighborhood where the offense is committed. This, to say nothing of the cases where the victim of lynch law could prove his innocence, if he were given a hearing before a cool, level-headed set of jurors in open court, makes the apparent contrast unfavorable to the black man. It is hardly proper, in summing up the value of any race, to dwell almost continually upon its weaker element. As other men are judged, so should the negro be judged, by the best that the race can produce, rather than by the worst. Keep the searchlight constantly focused upon the criminal and worthless element of any people, and few among all the races and nations of the world can be accounted successful. More attention should be directed to individuals who have succeeded, and less to those who have failed. And negroes who have succeeded grandly can be found in every corner of the South.

I doubt that much reliance can safely be placed upon mere ability to read and write a little as a means of saving any race.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Education should go further. One of the weaknesses in the negro's present condition grows out of failure, in the early years of his freedom, to teach him, in connection with thorough academic and religious branches, the dignity and beauty of labor, and to give him a working knowledge of the industries by which he must earn a subsistence. But the main question is: What is the present tendency of the race, where it has been given a fair opportunity, and where there has been thorough education of hand, head and heart? This question I answer from my own experience of nineteen years in the heart of the South, and from my daily contact with whites and blacks. In the first place, the social barrier prevents most white people from coming into real contact with the higher and better side of the negro's social life. The negro loafer, drunkard and gambler can be seen without social contact. The higher life cannot be seen without social contact. As I write these lines, I am in the home of a negro friend, where in the matter of cleanliness, sweetness, attractiveness, modern conveniences and other evidences of intelligence, morality and culture the home would compare favorably with that of any white family in the neighborhood; and yet, this negro home is unknown outside of the little town where it exists. To really know the life of this family, one would have to become a part of it for days, as I have been. One of the most encouraging changes that have taken place in the moral life of the negro race in the past thirty years is the creation of a growing public sentiment which draws a line between the good and bad, the clean and unclean. This change is fast taking place in every part of the country. It is one that cannot be accurately measured by any table of statistics. To be able to appreciate it fully, one must himself be a part of the social life of the race. The significance of it is all the more important when it is remembered that, only a few years ago, the colored woman who sustained immoral relations with some white man was envied and looked upon as a social leader. There are now few communities in the South where such a woman is recognized in the social life of the best colored people. This change is yet far from complete, but the tendency is strongly in this direction, and is growing and broadening. In a few more years the moral life of the negro will be greatly strengthened by that education which comes from the force of public opinion.

As to the effect of industrial education in the solution of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

race problem, we should not expect too much from it in a short time. To the late General S. C. Armstrong, of Hampton Institute, in Virginia, should be given the credit, mainly, for inaugurating this system of education. When the Hampton Institute began the systematic, industrial training of the negro, such training was unpopular among a large class of colored people. Later, when the same system was started by me at the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, in Alabama, it was still unpopular, especially in that part of the South. But the feeling against it has now almost completely disappeared in all parts of the country; so much so, that I do not consider the opposition of a few people here and there as of material consequence. Where there is one who opposes it there are thousands who indorse it. So far as the colored people are concerned, I consider that the battle for this principle has been fought and the victory won. What the colored people are anxious about is that, with industrial education, they shall have thorough mental and religious training; and in this they are right. For bringing about this change in the attitude of the colored people, much credit should be given to the John F. Slater Fund, under the wise guidance of such men as Mr. Morris K. Jesup and Dr. J. L. M. Curry, as well as to Dr. H. B. Frissell, of the Hampton Institute. That such institutions for industrial training as the Hampton Institute and the Tuskegee Institute are always crowded with the best class of negro students from nearly every State in the Union, and that every year they are compelled to refuse admission to hundreds of others, for lack of room and means, is sufficient evidence that the black race has come to appreciate the value of industrial education. The almost pathetic demand of the colored people for industrial education in every corner of the South is added evidence of the growing intelligence of the race. In saying what I do in regard to industrial education, I do not wish to be understood as meaning that the education of the negro should be confined to that kind alone, because we need men and women well educated in other directions; but, for the masses, industrial education is the supreme need. I repeat that we must not expect too much from this training, in the redemption of a race, in the space of a few years.

There are few institutions in the South where industrial training is given upon a large and systematic scale, and the graduates from these institutions have not had time to make them-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves felt to any very large extent upon the life of the rank and file of the people. But what are the indications? As I write, I have before me a record of graduates, which is carefully compiled each year. Of the hundreds who have been trained at the Tuskegee Institute, less than ten per cent. have failed, and less than five per cent. have failed because of any moral weakness. These graduates, as well as hundreds of other students who could not remain to finish the course, are now at work in the school-room, in the field, in the shop, in the home, or as teachers of industry, or in some way they are making their education felt in the lifting up of the colored people. Wherever these graduates go, they not only help their own race, but, in nearly every case, they win the respect and confidence of the white people.

Not long ago, I sent a number of letters to white men, in all the Southern States, asking, among others, this question: "Judged by actual observation in your own community, what is the effect of education upon the negro?" In asking this question, I was careful to explain that by education I did not mean a mere smattering, but a thorough education of the head, heart and hand. I received about three hundred replies, and there was only one who said that education did not help the negro. Most of the others were emphatic in stating that education made the negro a better citizen. In all the record of crime in the South, there are very few instances where a black man who has been thoroughly educated in the respects I have mentioned has been even charged with the crime of assaulting a woman. In fact, I do not know of a single instance of this kind, whether the man was educated in an industrial school or in a college.

The following extracts from a letter written by a Southern white man to the *Daily Advertiser*, of Montgomery, Alabama, contains most valuable testimony. The letter refers to convicts in Alabama, most of whom are colored:

"I was conversing not long ago with the warden of one of our mining prisons, containing about 500 convicts. The warden is a practical man, who has been in charge of prisoners for more than fifteen years, and has no theories of any kind to support. I remarked to him that I wanted some information as to the effect of manual training in preventing criminality, and asked him to state what per cent. of the prisoners under his charge had received any manual training, besides the acquaintance with the crudest agricultural labor. He replied: 'Perhaps about one per cent.' He added: 'No; much less

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than that. We have here at present only one mechanic; that is, there is one man who claims to be a house painter.'

"'Have you any shoemakers?'

"'Never have had a shoemaker.'

"'Have you any tailors?'

"'Never have had a tailor.'

"'Any printers?'

"'Never have had a printer.'

"'Any carpenters?'

"'Never have had a carpenter. There is not a man in this prison that could saw to a straight line.'"

Now, these facts seem to show that manual training is almost as good a preventive for criminality as vaccination is for smallpox.

We can best judge further of the value of industrial and academic education by using a few statistics bearing upon the State of Virginia, where graduates from the Hampton Institute and other schools have gone in large numbers and have had an opportunity, in point of time, to make their influence apparent upon the negro population. These statistics, based on census reports, were compiled mainly by persons connected with the Hampton Negro Conference:

"Taking taxation as a basis, the colored people of the State of Virginia contributed, in 1898, directly to the expenses of the State Government, the sum of $9,576.76, and for schools $3,239.41 from their personal property, a total of $12,816.17; while, from their real estate, for the purpose of the commonwealth there was paid by them $34,203.53, and for schools $11,457.22, or a total of $45,760.75—a grand total of $58,576.92.

"The report for the same year shows them to own 987,118 acres of land valued at $3,800,459, improved by buildings valued at $2,056,490, a total of $5,856,949. In the towns and cities, they own lots assessed at $2,154,331, improved by buildings valued at $3,400,636, a total of $5,554,976 for town property, and a grand total of $11,411,916 of their property of all kinds in the commonwealth. A comparative statement of different years would doubtless show a general upward tendency.

"The counties of Accomac, Essex, King and Queen, Middlesex, Mathews, Northampton, Northumberland, Richmond, Westmoreland, Gloucester, Princess Anne and Lancaster, all agricultural, show an aggregate of 114,197 acres held by negroes in 1897, the last year accounted for in official reports, against 108,824 held the previous year, an increase of 5,379, or nearly five per cent. The total valuation of land owned by negroes in the same counties for 1897, is $547,800 against $496,385 for the year next preceding, a gain of $51,150, or more than ten per cent. Their personal property, as assessed in 1897, was $517,560, in 1896, $527,688, a loss of $10,128. Combining the real and personal property for 1897, we have $1,409,059, against $1,320,504 for 1896, a net gain of $88,555, an increase of six and one-half per cent.

"The records of Gloucester, Lancaster, Middlesex, Princess Anne,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Northumberland, Northampton, King and Queen, Essex, and Westmoreland, where the colored population exceeds the white, show that the criminal expense for 1896 was $14,313.29, but for 1897 it was only $8,538.12, a saving of $5,774.17 to the State, or a falling off of forty per cent. This does not tell the whole story. In the first named year twenty-six persons were convicted of felonies, with sentences in the penitentiary, while in the year succeeding only nine, or one-third as many, were convicted of the graver offences of the law."

According to these returns, in 1892, when the colored people formed 41 per cent. of the population, they owned 2.75 per cent. of the total number of acres assessed for taxation, and 3.40 per cent. of the buildings; in 1898, although not constituting more than 37 per cent. of the population (by reason of white immigration), they owned 3.23 per cent. of the acreage assessed, and 4.64 per cent. of the buildings—a gain of nearly one-third in six years.

According to statistics gathered by a graduate of the Hampton Institute, in twelve counties in Virginia, there has been in the part of the State covered by the investigation an increase of 5,379 acres in the holdings of colored people, and an increase of $51,150 in the value of their land. In nine counties there has been a decrease in the number of persons charged with felonies and sent to the penitentiary from twenty-six in 1896 to nine in 1897.

I do not believe that the negro will grow weaker in morals and less strong in numbers because of his immediate contact with the white race. The first-class life insurance companies are considered excellent authorities as to the longevity of individuals and races; and the fact that most of them now seek to insure the educated class of blacks is a good test of what these companies think of the effect of education upon the mortality of the race.

The case of Jamaica, in the West Indies, presents a good example by which to judge the future of the negro in the United States, so far as mortality is concerned. The argument drawn from Jamaica is valuable, chiefly because the race there has been free for sixty-two years, instead of thirty-five, as in our own country. During the years of freedom, the blacks of Jamaica have been in constant contact with the white man. Slavery was abolished in Jamaica in 1838. The census of 1844 showed that there were 364,000 negroes in the Island. In 1871 there were 493,000, and in 1891 there were 610,579. In a history of Jamaica written by Mr. W. P. Livingston, who spent ten years studying the conditions of the Island, we find that, immediately after emancipation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the Island, there was something of the reaction that has taken place in some parts of our country; but that recently there has been a settling down to real, earnest life on the part of a large proportion of the race. After calling attention to certain weak and unsatisfactory phases in the life of the Jamaica negro, Mr. Livingston says:

> "This, then, is the race as it exists to-day, a product of sixty years of freedom; on the whole, a plain, honest, Anglicized people, with no peculiarity except a harmless ignorance and superstition. Looking at it in contrast with what it was at the beginning of the period, one cannot but be impressed with the wonderful progress it has made; and where there has been steady progress in the past, there is infinite hope for the future. * * * * * * The impact of Roman power and culture on the northern barbarians of the United Kingdom did not make itself felt for three hundred years. * * * * * Instead of dying off before civilization, he (the negro) grows stronger as he comes within its best influences."

In comparing the black race of Jamaica with that of the United States, it should be borne in mind that the negro in America enjoys advantages and encouragements which the race in Jamaica does not possess.

What I have said, I repeat, is based largely upon my own experience and observation, rather than upon statistics. I do not wish to convey the impression that the problem before our country is not a large and serious one; but I do believe that in a judicious system of industrial, mental and religious training we have found the method of solving it. What we most need is the money necessary to make the system effective. The indications are hopeful, not discouraging; and not the least encouraging is the fact that, in addition to the munificence of Northern philanthropists and the appropriations of the Southern State Governments from common taxation, with the efforts of the negro himself, we have now reached a point at which the solution of this problem is drawing to its aid some of the most thoughtful and cultured white men and women of the South, as is indicated by the article to which I have already referred, from the pen of Professor John Roach Straton, a representative of the best element of the South.

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STEPHEN CRANE.

FROM AN ENGLISH STANDPOINT.

BY H. G. WELLS.

THE untimely death at thirty of Stephen Crane robs English literature of an interesting and significant figure, and the little world of those who write, of a stout friend and a pleasant comrade. For a year and more he had been ailing. The bitter hardships of his Cuban expedition had set its mark upon mind and body alike, and the slow darkling of the shadow upon him must have been evident to all who were not blinded by their confidence in what he was yet to do. Altogether, I knew Crane for less than a year, and I saw him for the last time hardly more than seven weeks ago. He was then in a hotel at Dover, lying still and comfortably wrapped about, before an open window and the calm and spacious sea. If you would figure him as I saw him, you must think of him as a face of a type very typically American, long and spare, with very straight hair and straight features and long, quiet hands and hollow eyes, moving slowly, smiling and speaking slowly, with that deliberate New Jersey manner he had, and lapsing from speech again into a quiet contemplation of his ancient enemy. For it was the sea that had taken his strength, the same sea that now shone, level waters beyond level waters, with here and there a minute, shining ship, warm and tranquil beneath the tranquil evening sky. Yet I felt scarcely a suspicion then that this was a last meeting. One might have seen it all, perhaps. He was thin and gaunt and wasted, too weak for more than a remembered jest and a greeting and good wishes. It did not seem to me in any way credible that he would reach his refuge in the Black Forest only to die at the journey's end. It will be a long time yet before I can fully realize that he is no longer a contemporary of mine; that the last I saw of him was, indeed, final and complete.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Though my personal acquaintance with Crane was so soon truncated, I have followed his work for all the four years it has been known in England. I have always been proud, and now I am glad, that, however obscurely, I also was in the first chorus of welcome that met his coming. It is, perhaps, no great distinction for me; he was abundantly praised; but, at least, I was early and willing to praise him when I was wont to be youthfully jealous of my praises. His success in England began with "The Red Badge of Courage," which did, indeed, more completely than any other book has done for many years, take the reading public by storm. Its freshness of method, its vigor of imagination, its force of color and its essential freedom from many traditions that dominate this side of the Atlantic, came—in spite of the previous shock of Mr. Kipling—with a positive effect of impact. It was a new thing, in a new school. When one looked for sources, one thought at once of Tolstoi; but, though it was clear that Tolstoi had exerted a powerful influence upon the conception, if not the actual writing, of the book, there still remained something entirely original and novel. To a certain extent, of course, that was the new man as an individual; but, to at least an equal extent, it was the new man as a typical young American, free at last, as no generation of Americans have been free before, of any regard for English criticism, comment or tradition, and applying to literary work the conception and theories of the cosmopolitan studio with a quite American directness and vigor. For the great influence of the studio on Crane cannot be ignored; in the persistent selection of the essential elements of an impression, in the ruthless exclusion of mere information, in the direct vigor with which the selected points are made, there is Whistler even more than there is Tolstoi in "The Red Badge of Courage." And witness this, taken almost haphazard:

"At nightfall the column broke into regimental pieces, and the fragments went into the fields to camp. Tents sprang up like strange plants. Camp fires, like red, peculiar blossoms, dotted the night. * * * From this little distance the many fires, with the black forms of men passing to and fro before the crimson rays, made weird and satanic effects."

And here again; consider the daring departure from all academic requirements, in this void countenance:

"A warm and strong hand clasped the youth's languid fingers for an instant, and then he heard a cheerful and audacious whistling as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the man strode away. As he who had so befriended him was thus passing out of his life, it suddenly occurred to the youth that he had not once seen his face."

I do not propose to add anything here to the mass of criticism upon this remarkable book. Like everything else which has been abundantly praised, it has occasionally been praised "all wrong;" and I suppose that it must have been said hundreds of times that this book is a subjective study of the typical soldier in war. But Mr. George Wyndham, himself a soldier of experience, has pointed out in an admirable preface to a re-issue of this and other of Crane's war studies, that the hero of the "Red Badge" is, and is intended to be, altogether a more sensitive and imaginative person than the ordinary man. He is the idealist, the dreamer of boastful things brought suddenly to the test of danger and swift occasions and the presence of death. To this theme Crane returned several times, and particularly in a story called "Death and the Child" that was written after the Greek war. That story is considered by very many of Crane's admirers as absolutely his best. I have carefully re-read it in deference to opinions I am bound to respect, but I still find it inferior to the earlier work. The generalized application is, to my taste, a little too evidently underlined; there is just that touch of insistence that prevails so painfully at times in Victor Hugo's work, as of a writer not sure of his reader, not happy in his reader and seeking to drive his implication (of which also he is not quite sure) home. The child is not a natural child; there is no happy touch to make it personally alive; it is THE CHILD, something unfalteringly big; a large, pink, generalized thing, I cannot help but see it, after the fashion of a Vatican cherub. The fugitive runs panting to where, all innocent of the battle about it, it plays; and he falls down breathless to be asked, "Are you a man?" One sees the intention clearly enough; but in the later story it seems to me there is a new ingredient that is absent from the earlier stories, an ingredient imposed on Crane's natural genius from without—a concession to the demands of a criticism it had been wiser, if less modest, in him to disregard—criticism that missed this quality of generalization and demanded it, even though it had to be artificially and deliberately introduced.

Following hard upon the appearance of "The Red Badge of Courage" in England came reprints of two books, "Maggie" and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"George's Mother," that had already appeared in America six years earlier. Their reception gave Crane his first taste of the peculiarities of the new public he had come upon. These stories seem to me in no way inferior to the "Red Badge;" and at times there are passages, the lament of Maggie's mother at the end of "Maggie," for example, that it would be hard to beat by any passage from the later book. But on all hands came discouragement or tepid praise. The fact of it is, there had been almost an orgie of praise—for England, that is; and ideas and adjectives and phrases were exhausted. To write further long reviews on works displaying the same qualities as had been already amply discussed in the notices of the "Red Badge" would be difficult and laborious; while to admit an equal excellence and deny an equal prominence would be absurd. But to treat these stories as early work, to find them immature, dismiss them and proceed to fresher topics, was obvious and convenient. So it was, I uncharitably imagine, that these two tales have been overshadowed and are still comparatively unknown. Yet, they are absolutely essential to a just understanding of Crane. In these stories, and in these alone, he achieved tenderness and a compulsion of sympathy for other than vehement emotions, qualities that the readers of "The Third Violet" and "On Active Service," his later love stories, might well imagine beyond his reach.

And upon the appearance of these books in England came what, in my present mood, I cannot but consider as the great blunder and misfortune of Crane's life. It is a trait of the public we writers serve, that to please it is to run the gravest risk of never writing again. Through a hundred channels and with a hundred varieties of seduction and compulsion, the public seeks to induce its favorite to do something else—to act, to lecture, to travel, to jump down volcanoes or perform in music halls, to do anything, rather than to possess his soul in peace and to pursue the work he was meant to do. Indeed, this modern public is as violently experimental with its writers as a little child with a kitten. It is animated, above all things, by an insatiable desire to plunge its victim into novel surroundings, and watch how he feels. And since Crane had demonstrated, beyond all cavil, that he could sit at home and, with nothing but his wonderful brain and his wonderful induction from recorded things, build up the truest and most convincing picture of war; since he was a fas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tidious and careful worker, intensely subjective in his mental habit; since he was a man of fragile physique and of that unreasonable courage that will wreck the strongest physique; and since, moreover, he was habitually a bad traveller, losing trains and luggage and missing connections even in the orderly circumstances of peace, it was clearly the most reasonable thing in the world to propose, it was received with the applause of two hemispheres as a most right and proper thing, that he should go as a war correspondent, first to Greece and then to Cuba. Thereby, and for nothing but disappointment and bitterness, he utterly wrecked his health. He came into comparison with men as entirely his masters in this work as he was the master of all men in his own; and I read even in the most punctual of his obituary notices the admission of his journalistic failure. I have read, too, that he brought back nothing from these expeditions. But, indeed, even not counting his death, he brought back much. On his way home from Cuba he was wrecked, and he wrote the story of the nights and days that followed the sinking of the ship with a simplicity and vigor that even he cannot rival elsewhere.

"The Open Boat" is to my mind, beyond all question, the crown of all his work. It has all the stark power of the earlier stories, with a new element of restraint; the color is as full and strong as ever, fuller and stronger, indeed; but those chromatic splashes that at times deafen and confuse in "The Red Badge," those images that astonish rather than enlighten, are disciplined and controlled. "That and 'Flanagan'," he told me, with a philosophical laugh, "was all I got out of Cuba." I cannot say whether they were worth the price, but I am convinced that these two things are as immortal as any work of any living man. And the way "The Open Boat" begins, no stress, plain—even a little gray and flattish:

> "None of them knew the color of the sky. Their eyes glanced level, and were fastened upon the waves that swept toward them. These waves were of the hue of slate, save for the tops, which were of foaming white, and all of the men knew the color of the sea. The horizon narrowed and widened, and dipped and rose, and at all times its edge was jagged with waves that seemed thrust up in points like rocks.
>
> "Many a man ought to have a bath-tub larger than the boat which here rode upon the sea. These waves were most wrongfully and barbarously abrupt and tall, and each froth-top was a problem in small-boat navigation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The cook squatted in the bottom, and looked with both eyes at the six inches of gunwale which separated him from the ocean. His sleeves were rolled over his fat forearms, and the two flaps of his unbuttoned vest dangled as he bent to bail out the boat. Often he said, 'Gawd! That was a narrow clip.' As he remarked it, he invariably gazed eastward over the broken sea.

"The oiler, steering with one of the two oars in the boat, sometimes raised himself suddenly to keep clear of the water that swirled in over the stern. It was a thin little oar and it seemed often ready to snap.

"The correspondent, pulling at the other oar, watched the waves and wondered why he was there."

From that beginning, the story mounts and mounts over the waves, wave frothing after wave, each wave a threat, and the men toil and toil and toil again; by insensible degrees the day lights the waves to green and olive, and the foam grows dazzling. Then as the long day draws out, they come toward the land.

"'Look! There's a man on the shore!'

"'Where?'

"'There! See 'im?'

"'Yes, sure! He's walking along.'

"'Now he's stopped. Look! He's facing us!'

"'So he is, by thunder!'

"'Ah, now we're all right! Now we're all right! There'll be a boat out here for us in half-an-hour.'

"'He's going on. He's running. He's going up to that house there.'

"The remote beach seemed lower than the sea, and it required a searching glance to discern the little black figure. The captain saw a floating stick and they rowed to it. A bath-towel was by some weird chance in the boat, and, tying this on the stick, the captain waved it. The oarsman did not dare turn his head, so he was obliged to ask questions.

"'What's he doing now?'

"'He's standing still again. He's looking, I think. . . . There he goes again. Towards the house. Now he's stopped again.'

"'Is he waving at us?'

"'No, not now! he was, though.'

"'Look! There comes another man!'

"'He's running.'

. . . . . .

"'Well, I wish I could make something out of those signals. What do you suppose he means!'

"'He don't mean anything. He's just playing.'

"'Well, if he'd just signal us to try the surf again, or to go to sea and wait, or go north, or go south, or go to hell—there would be some reason in it. But look at him. He just stands there and keeps his coat revolving like a wheel. The ass!'

"'There come more people.'

"'Now there's quite a mob. Look! Isn't that a boat?'

"'Where? Oh, I see where you mean. No, that's no boat.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"'That fellow is still waving his coat.'

"'He must think we like to see him do that. Why don't he quit it? It don't mean anything.'

"'I don't know. I think he is trying to make us go north. It must be that there's a life saving station there somewhere.'

"'Say, he ain't tired yet. Look at 'im wave.'

. . . . . .

"'Holy smoke!' said one, allowing his voice to express his impious mood. 'If we keep on monkeying out here! If we've got to flounder out here all night!'

"'Oh, we'll never have to stay here all night! Don't you worry. They've seen us now, and it won't be long before they'll come chasing out after us.'

"The shore grew dusky. The man waving a coat blended gradually into this gloom, and it swallowed in the same manner the omnibus and the group of people. The spray, when it dashed uproariously over the side, made the voyagers shrink and swear like men who were being branded.

"'I'd like to catch the chump who waved the coat. I feel like soaking him one, just for luck.'

"'Why? What did he do?'

. . . . . .

"In the meantime the oiler rowed, and then the correspondent rowed, and then the oiler rowed. Grey-faced and bowed forward, they mechanically, turn by turn, plied the leaden oars. The form of the lighthouse had vanished from the southern horizon, but finally a pale star appeared, just lifting from the sea. The streaked saffron in the west passed before the all-merging darkness, and the sea to the east was black. The land had vanished, and was expressed only by the low and dread thunder of the surf."

"The Open Boat" gives its title to a volume containing, in addition to that and "Flanagan," certain short pieces. One of these others, at least, is also to my mind a perfect thing, "The Wise Men." It tells of the race between two bar-tenders in the city of Mexico, and I cannot imagine how it could possibly have been better told. And in this volume, too, is that other masterpiece—the one I deny—"Death and the Child."

Now I do not know how Crane took the reception of this book, for he was not the man to babble of his wrongs; but I cannot conceive how it could have been anything but a grave disappointment to him. To use the silly phrase of the literary shopman, "the vogue of the short story" was already over; rubbish, pure rubbish, provided only it was lengthy, had resumed its former precedence again in the reviews, in the publishers' advertisements and on the library and book-sellers' counters. The book was taken as a trivial by-product, its author was exhorted to abandon this produc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of "brilliant fragments"—anything less than fifty thousand words is a fragment to the writer of literary columns—and to make that "sustained effort," that architectural undertaking, that alone impresses the commercial mind. Of course, the man who can call "The Open Boat" a brilliant fragment would reproach Rodin for not completing the edifice his brilliant fragments of statuary are presumably intended to adorn, and would sigh, with the late Mr. Ruskin for the day when Mr. Whistler would "finish" his pictures. Moreover, he was strongly advised—just as they have advised Mr. Kipling—to embark upon a novel. And from other quarters, where a finer wisdom might have been displayed, he learned that the things he had written were not "short stories" at all; they were "sketches" perhaps, "anecdotes"—just as they call Mr. Kipling's short stories "anecdotes;" and it was insinuated that for him also the true, the ineffable "short story" was beyond his reach. I think it is indisputable that the quality of this reception, which a more self-satisfied or less sensitive man than Crane might have ignored, did react very unfavorably upon his work. They put him out of conceit with these brief intense efforts in which his peculiar strength was displayed.

It was probably such influence that led him to write "The Third Violet." I do not know certainly, but I imagine, that the book was to be a demonstration, and it is not a successful demonstration, that Crane could write a charming love story. It is the very simple affair of an art student and a summer boarder, with the more superficial incidents of their petty encounters set forth in a forcible, objective manner that is curiously hard and unsympathetic. The characters act, and on reflection one admits they act, *true,* but the play of their emotions goes on behind the curtain of the style, and all the enrichments of imaginative appeal that make love beautiful are omitted. Yet, though the story as a whole fails to satisfy, there are many isolated portions of altogether happy effectiveness, a certain ride behind an ox cart, for example. Much more surely is "On Active Service" an effort, and in places a painful effort, to fit his peculiar gift to the uncongenial conditions of popular acceptance. It is the least capable and least satisfactory of all Crane's work.

While these later books were appearing, and right up to his last fatal illness, Crane continued to produce fresh war pictures that show little or no falling off in vigor of imagination and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

handling; and, in addition, he was experimenting with verse. In that little stone-blue volume, "War is Kind," and in the earlier "Black Riders," the reader will find a series of acute and vivid impressions and many of the finer qualities of Crane's descriptive prose, but he will not find any novel delights of melody or cadence or any fresh aspects of Crane's personality. There remain some children's stories to be published and an unfinished romance. With that the tale of his published work ends, and the career of one of the most brilliant, most significant and most distinctively American of all English writers comes to its unanticipated *finis.*

It would be absurd, here and now, to attempt to apportion any relativity of importance to Crane, to say that he was greater than A. or less important than B. That class-list business is, indeed, best left forever to the newspaper plebiscite and the library statistician; among artists, whose sole, just claim to recognition and whose sole title to immortality must necessarily be the possession of unique qualities, that is to say, of unclassifiable factors, these gradations are absurd. Suffice it that, even before his death, Crane's right to be counted in the hierarchy of those who have made a permanent addition to the great and growing fabric of English letters was not only assured, but conceded. To define his position in time, however, and in relation to periods and modes of writing will be a more reasonable undertaking; and it seems to me that, when at last the true proportions can be seen, Crane will be found to occupy a position singularly cardinal. He was a New Englander of Puritan lineage, and the son of a long tradition of literature. There had been many Cranes who wrote before him. He has shown me a shelf of books, for the most part the pious and theological works of various antecedent Stephen Cranes. He had been at some pains to gather together these alien products of his kin. For the most part they seemed little, insignificant books, and one opened them to read the beaten *clichés,* the battered outworn phrases, of a movement that has ebbed. Their very size and binding suggested a dying impulse, that very same impulse that in its prime had carried the magnificence of Milton's imagery and the pomp and splendors of Milton's prose. In Crane that impulse was altogether dead. He began stark—I find all through this brief notice I have been repeating that in a dozen disguises, "freedom from tradition," "absolute directness" and the like—as though he came into the world of letters without ever a predeces-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sor. In style, in method and in all that is distinctively *not* found in his books, he is sharply defined, the expression in literary art of certain enormous repudiations. Was ever a man before who wrote of battles so abundantly as he has done, and never had a word, never a word from first to last, of the purpose and justification of the war? And of the God of Battles, no more than the battered name; "Hully Gee!"—the lingering trace of the Deity! And of the sensuousness and tenderness of love, so much as one can find in "The Third Violet!" Any richness of allusion, any melody or balance of phrase, the half quotation that refracts and softens and enriches the statement, the momentary digression that opens like a window upon beautiful or distant things, are not merely absent, but obviously and sedulously avoided. It is as if the racial thought and tradition had been razed from his mind and its site ploughed and salted. He is more than himself in this; he is the first expression of the opening mind of a new period, or, at least, the early emphatic phase of a new initiative—beginning, as a growing mind must needs begin, with the record of impressions, a record of a vigor and intensity beyond all precedent.

H. G. WELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY GENERAL SHERMAN DECLINED THE NOMINATION IN 1884.*

BEING A LETTER, HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED, FROM GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN TO UNITED STATES SENATOR J. R. DOOLITTLE, OF WISCONSIN.

912 GARRISON AVENUE, ST. LOUIS, MO.,
June 10, 1884.

HON. J. R. DOOLITTLE,
RACINE, WIS.

My Dear Sir: This morning's mail brought me your letter of the 8th, and, though packing my trunk for a trip to Southwest Missouri—Carthage, Joplin, etc.—in fulfillment of a promise made my old soldiers two months ago, I think I had better answer you.

The Law compelled my retirement from the command of the Army because I was sixty-four years of age. I favored the law, because the average man of sixty-four or sixty-five is usually incapacitated for military service, which demands not only mental strength but physical. I had seen so many good officers cling to their commissions long after it was plain to all except themselves that their day had passed—conspicuously so Scott, Bonneville, etc.—that I really wanted to retire whilst I had sense enough, and before I could be subjected to the hints and flings that Sherman, naturally eccentric, was becoming old and obstructive. If too old to command an army of twenty-five thousand men, of course I

*Senator Doolittle was one of those who ardently desired that General Sherman should become a candidate for the Presidency. Feeling confident that the nomination of the great commander was assured, the Senator wrote him a letter offering suggestions as to points which it seemed desirable to cover in his letter of acceptance. General Sherman replied that he had forbidden the use of his name in the Convention, and Senator Doolittle responded in a communication of some length, in which he expressed great regret at the General's decision, and pointed out the services which the veteran might have rendered to the country as President. The letter printed above is General Sherman's answer to this communication.—EDITOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was too old to be the President and Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. Therefore I notified my own brother, and all who were entitled to my confidence, that I must not be used by any political convention for *its* purpose and convenience.

During the Convention at Chicago I was notified by men high in authority that, in case there should be a deadlock as between the two strong candidates, Arthur and Blaine, my name would surely be used, whether I consented or not.

I may be eccentric, but I think I am not a fool, an ass, to be used by others at their will, and I simply confided to a friend, in position to act, that they had better not make too free use of my name, as I had old-fashioned ideas of freedom and the right of every man to shape his own destiny; that I was not in the habit of calling a council of war to throw off on it the responsibility, but had already decided for myself, and advised the Convention that if it used my name without my consent I might answer in terms which would damage it as well as myself. Of course, my name was dropped, and Blaine was nominated.

I know Blaine well and have since he was a boy of ten years of age. He is talented, as all admit, and as honest as the time calls for. He has been heavily taxed, not only by his immediate family, but by brothers, sisters, cousins and aunts, and he has been to them most kind and generous, as I *know*. Had he limited his action to his Congressional salary, his brothers and sisters would have been dependent on others, and he was forced to embark in private enterprises. He favored, rightfully, the building of the great Trans-Continental Roads, Congress aiding by the grant of alternate sections out for ten miles, doubling the price of the remainder, just as you or I or any honest owner would gladly do to increase the value of the general estate. I don't know that Blaine made any profit thereby, but I hope he did. This clamor against the Pacific Railroad Grants is to me the veriest demagoguery, for in 1865 I would have freely given all of Nebraska, Wyoming, Utah and Nevada, yea, been willing to throw in New Mexico, to any corporation which would have guaranteed to build *one* Pacific Road; now we have *four*. And they add more strength to the Union of this nation than all the Politics of both Republican and Democratic parties in the last fifty years.

Logan was a good soldier, and Blaine and Logan are fair can-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

didates for the Republicans. Now let the Democrats put out a ticket of their best representative men.

And then fight it out.

It don't make much difference which wins—neither can do any good. The real question is, Which will do the *least* harm?

Our people insist on being governed by Parties full of virtuous professions, but slack of performance; and the time is opportune for a full and fair fight as between them. I am not entitled to a vote, and therefore disqualified from expressing my opinion, but I surely do account myself happy and fortunate in escaping so easily a danger I dreaded.

With respect, your Friend,

W. T. SHERMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IMPERIALISM AMERICA'S HISTORIC POLICY.

BY W. A. PEFFER, FORMERLY UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM KANSAS.

THE arraignment of the National Administration by certain of our citizens on a charge of imperialism, in the execution of its Philippine policy, brings up for discussion in the pending campaign some important questions relating to the powers, duties and responsibilities of government, among which are three that I propose to consider briefly in this article, namely:

First. Whence comes the right to govern? What are its sphere and object?

Second. Are we, the people of the United States, a self-governing people?

Third. Is our Philippine policy anti-American?

I.

As to the right to govern—the right to exercise authority over communities, states and nations, the right to enact, construe and execute laws—whence is it derived? For what purposes and to what extent may it be properly assumed?

In the Declaration of Independence it is asserted that:

> "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

But is it true that government, even in a republic like ours, derives its just powers only from the consent of the governed? Is it not a fact that at no time in our history have we either had or asked the consent of all the people within our jurisdiction, to the powers of government which we have been exercising over them? Is it not true, on the contrary, that we have been govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing many of them not only without their consent, but in direct opposition to it?

The Constitution, framed to provide such a form of government as the signers of the Declaration had in mind, contains the following provision:

> "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

And this:

> "The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a duty or tax may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person."

These two provisions were intended to apply and did apply to negro slaves, of whom there were in the country at that time about half a million, nearly one-sixth of the entire population; and they, as a class, together with our Indian neighbors and the free people of color, were all excluded from the ranks of those who participated in the institution of our new government. Their consent to anything done or contemplated in the administration of our public affairs was neither asked nor desired. Their consent or dissent did not enter into the problems of government. It made no difference what their wishes were, or to what they were opposed. A majority of such persons as enjoyed political privileges—they and they only—formed the new government and organized its powers, without regard to the disfranchised classes, as much so as if these classes had not been in existence.

And, in addition to the non-voting people, there were many white men in the States who, by reason of their poverty, were not permitted to vote, and hence could not take part in popular elections. It is, probably, safe to say that, of the whole population of the country, when the Constitution was put into effect, the number that had no part in the work of establishing the National Government, either for or against it, although they were subject to its rule, constituted at least twenty-five per cent.

Still more. In every one of the States, and among those persons, too, qualified to vote, there was opposition, more or less, to the inauguration of the new regime. North Carolina did not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ratify the Constitution till more than two years after the convention that framed it had adjourned *sine die;* and Rhode Island did not come into the Union till May of President Washington's second year.

There is no way of ascertaining exactly the number of voters who were opposed to the new plan, who did not consent to it, and who would have defeated it if they could; but, if these be added to the disfranchised classes, we have a total of at least one-third of the inhabitants of the country not consenting to the exercise of these governmental powers over them. Yet these powers were deemed by the majority that organized them to be just powers, and the said majority felt that they were justified in executing them.

Thomas Jefferson held "the vital principle of republics" to be "absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority." But whence comes the right of a majority to rule? And may the majority of to-day determine the course of the majority of to-morrow? Had two-thirds of a population of less than four million in 1789 the rightful authority to lay down rules of government for a population of seventy-five millions in 1900—rules which we cannot change, save by revolution, unless we do it in accordance with forms prescribed by our ancestors more than a hundred years ago?

We all believe with Jefferson that the right of a majority to rule in a republic is not to be challenged; and the answer to these troublesome questions concerning the source of this undisputed right to govern can be found only in the theory, that government is one of the essential agencies provided in the beginning by the Father above for the work of subduing the earth and bringing all men to Himself. The thought is tersely expressed by St. Paul in his letter to the Romans: "There is no power but of God." "The powers that be are ordained of God." The ruler is a "minister of God."

Man's right to life, liberty and room to work in is inherent, and government follows as naturally as the seasons follow each other. As long as the individual man lives separated from his fellows, he needs no protection other than he is able himself to command; but when population increases and men gather in communities, governments are instituted among them in order to make these individual rights secure; and then new rights appear,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

communal rights; for communities, as well as individual persons, have rights.

The necessity for government increases with the density of population, and the scope of its powers is enlarged with the extension of its territorial jurisdiction, the diversity of employments in which the citizenship are engaged and the degree of refinement to which they have attained. The trapper, with his axe, knife, gun and sack, pursues his calling alone in the wilderness; but, with settlement, the forest disappears, farms are opened up, towns laid out, neighborhoods formed, laws become necessary, and government begins.

It is not necessary, however, that we should agree on the origin of government, for we know that, as a matter of fact, governments in one form or another have existed ever since the beginning of recorded history; and we know, further, that under the operation of these governments ninety per cent. of the habitable surface of the globe has been reclaimed from barbarism. The whole world is to-day virtually within the jurisdiction of regularly organized powers of government, international law is recognized and enforced as part of the general code of the nations, and the trend of the world's civilization is toward free institutions and popular forms of government.

II.

As to whether we are a self-governing people, the answer to this question depends upon whether all classes of the population within our jurisdiction share in the work of governing, or whether, as in the ancient republics, only a portion of the people are to be taken for the whole for purposes of government.

In any age of the world, the character of government fairly represents the state of the world's inhabitants at that particular period. That a people are not far enough advanced to form a government for themselves and conduct its affairs in their own way is not a reason why they should not have any government at all. On its lower level, government may extend no further than the will of an ignorant despot who holds the tenure of life and property in his hands; but as men advance, they rise to higher levels and the sphere of government is enlarged. In the end it will, of necessity, embrace all human interests which are common.

The members of the Continental Congress, in declaring the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause which impelled the separation of the colonies from the mother country, began the concluding paragraph of the Declaration in these words:

"We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, etc."

The words "good people of these colonies" included only such of the people as at that time participated in the work of local government, excluding those who were opposed to separation. The Tories, and there were a good many of them, did not approve anything that the Congress did. They were regarded by the patriots as public enemies, and were kept under constant watch by committees of inspection and observation in every county. They were subject to arrest and imprisonment—even to banishment; and in many instances their property was confiscated. The Congress surely did not speak in the name of the Tories, nor by their authority.

The Articles of Confederation, under the provisions of which the Congress acted after March 2nd, 1781, recognized as its constituency only "the free inhabitants of each of these States." Slaves, though constituting nearly, if not quite, sixteen per cent. of the population, were not reckoned among the political forces to be respected. Indians, likewise, were excluded.

The Constitution of the United States opens thus:

"We, the people of the United States . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

But not more than two-thirds of the population were represented in "We, the people," and a majority of the two-thirds assumed the responsibilities of government—rightfully, as all loyal Americans believe. The machinery of the Republic was set in motion in 1789, and the census taken the next year showed the total population to be 3,929,214, of which total number 757,208 were colored—mostly persons of African descent, who were nearly all slaves, and these, with the other disfranchised classes, as before stated, made up about thirty-three per cent. of the population that were not permitted to take part in establishing the new government.

Furthermore, when the Constitution was submitted to the Legislatures of the several States for their action, it was strenuously

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opposed in some of them, and received unanimous support in only three—Delaware, New Jersey and Georgia. The majority in its favor was large in Connecticut and South Carolina, while in Virginia the majority was only ten votes, and in New York only three. The vote in five of the States stood thus: Pennsylvania, 46 to 23; Massachusetts, 187 to 168; Maryland, 63 to 11; New Hampshire, 57 to 46; New York, 30 to 27. North Carolina and Rhode Island were two years in making up their minds to accept places in the Union.

So we see that a majority of about two-thirds (and that may have been in fact less than a majority of the whole people) assumed to speak and act for all. The people of the United States have all along acted on that plan. We have gone even further than that. We have in some cases expressly authorized minorities to determine the gravest matters. The Constitution provides that "a majority of each (House of Congress) shall constitute a quorum to do business;" and "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." The Senate now consists of ninety members; forty-six is a majority, constituting a quorum. Of this forty-six, twenty-four form a majority, and although it is less than one-third of the whole body, may pass any measure that is not required by the Constitution to receive a majority or a two-thirds vote—a treaty, for example. And it is the same in the House of Representatives.

And, although a majority of the electoral vote is required to choose a President of the United States, it has frequently happened that the successful candidate was opposed by a majority of the voters of the country.

In the matter of amending the Constitution, a majority of the voters may favor any particular amendment proposed, but it must be ratified by three-fourths of the Legislatures of the several States before it becomes law.

We not only have adopted the majority principle as a rule of government, but we have uniformly insisted upon acquiescence in minority rule in any and all cases where it has been so provided in advance.

We have but to look at our record to see that, from the beginning, we have excluded a very large proportion of our own people from all participation in affairs of government, and we have never accused ourselves of exercising unjust powers or undue au-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thority. This fact strengthens the belief that there is a source of power which does not lie in the people at all—a "higher power," if you please. The Declaration of Independence conforms to this view, in affirming that men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," and in appealing to the "Supreme Judge of the world," "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

III.

In order to determine whether our Philippine policy is anti-American, we must examine the testimony of American history, and see the record that Americans have made for themselves in their treatment of subject people in our own country.

Virginia and New England may fairly be taken as representative of the Colonies up to the time of the Revolution, in so far as the Indian population is concerned.

Patents to the London Company and to the Plymouth Company were issued in 1606 by King James I., authorizing them to "possess and colonize that portion of North America lying between the thirty-fourth and forty-fifth parallels of north latitude." What legal rights or privileges James had in America were based wholly on the discoveries made by English navigators. Rights of the native inhabitants were not considered in the granting of these patents, nor in the subsequent colonization.

The London Company colonized Virginia and the Plymouth Company and its successors colonized New England. In both cases landings were effected and settlements begun without consulting the people that inhabited the country.

As to Virginia, among the early acts of the Jamestown colony, under the lead of Captain Smith, was the procuring of food from the Indians by trading with them, and at the some time fortifying the new settlement against Indian depredations. Smith strengthened the fort in 1608, trained the watch regularly and exercised the company every Saturday. No organized opposition to the white settlement appeared during the first few years, though the Indians manifested their dissatisfaction in the arrest of Smith, whom they would have summarily put to death but for the intercession of the Chief's daughter. But in 1622, under Opechancanough, they attacked the settlers, killed several hundred of them, and devastated a good many plantations. They were finally

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beaten back by the whites, many of them being unmercifully slaughtered, and the rest driven into the wilderness. Twenty-two years later, under lead of the same Chief, another war broke out, lasting two years, causing much loss of life and property on both sides, and resulting in the utter defeat of the Indians and the cession by them of large tracts of land to the colonists.

This policy was pursued to the end—whites advancing, Indians receding—up to the end of the colonial period, when the whole State, practically, belonged to the whites.

The Plymouth Colony early sent Captain Standish, with a few men, to confer with the natives and ascertain, if possible, the state of their feeling in regard to the white settlement; but the Indians eluded him and he learned nothing. The second year after this reconnoisance Canonicus, King or Chief of the Narragansetts, by way of showing how he felt about it, sent to the Plymouth people a bundle of arrows tied with the skin of a rattlesnake. As an answer to this challenge, the skin was stuffed with powder and bullets and returned. These exchanges of compliments opened the way for a peace treaty between the settlers and several tribes; but some of the chiefs were suspicious of the whites and formed a conspiracy to kill them off. The scheme coming to the knowledge of the colonists, it was frustrated by Standish and his company, who treacherously killed two chiefs. A treaty of peace with the Narragansetts soon followed this occurrence, and it remained in force until the Wampanoags, weary of encroachments on their lands by the whites, made war on them under the leadership of King Philip, in 1675.

Among the incidents of that war, and as showing the temper of the colonists, may be mentioned the destruction of the Narragansett fort and the subsequent capture and treatment of Philip. The fort sheltered about three thousand Narragansetts, mostly women and children. It was surprised during a snowstorm, the palisades and wigwams were fired, and the Indians were driven forth by the flames to be either burnt, suffocated, frozen, butchered or drowned in the surrounding swamp. History says that "500 wigwams were destroyed, 600 warriors killed, 1,000 women and children massacred, and the winter's provisions of the tribe reduced to ashes." "The Government set a price of thirty shillings per head for every Indian killed in battle, and many women and children were sold into slavery in South America and the West

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indies." Toward the last, Captain Church, the noted Indian fighter, headed an expedition to find Philip and destroy the remainder of the Wampanoags. Philip was hunted from place to place, and at last found in camp on the 12th of August, 1676. The renegade Indian who betrayed the Narragansett camp led Captain Church to the camp of Philip. The attack was made at night, while the Indians were asleep. Philip, in attempting to escape, was recognized by an Indian ally of the whites and shot dead as he stumbled and fell into the mire. His body was dragged forward, and Church cut off his head, which was borne on the point of a spear to Plymouth, where it remained twenty years exposed on a gibbet. According to the colonial laws, as a traitor, his body was drawn and quartered on a day that was appointed for public thanksgiving.*

With this policy steadily pursued to the end, when the time came for Americans themselves to turn upon their oppressors, there was little left of the Indian question in New England and Virginia, or in any of the States; but with the Declaration of Independence, the formation of the federal union and the establishment of a national government for the whole country, our Indian troubles were confined chiefly to territory belonging to the Union, regions acquired after the Union was formed, and hence national territories under the sole jurisdiction of the national government, though inhabited by Indians, whose rights to the soil had never been questioned. What has been our policy with respect to this subject race in our new territorial acquisitions, we shall now see.

The region bounded on the north by the Great Lakes, on the east by the Allegheny Mountains, on the south by the Ohio River, on the west by the Mississippi, out of which have grown the States of Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois and Indiana, had been claimed under their charters by Virginia, New York, Connecticut and Massachusetts, but they ceded their claims to the United States.* The country so ceded was our first territorial acquisition, and became known as the Northwest Territory. A government was provided for it under the ordinance of 1787, and President Washington, in 1789, appointed General Arthur St. Clair its governor. The various tribes of Indians inhabiting that part of

*See "Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography," article, King Philip.

*Except a small portion reserved by Connecticut, afterward known as the "Western Reserve."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country objected to the jurisdiction of the whites, just as some of the Filipinos have done in the Philippine Islands, and they made war on the whites under Michikiniqua, chief of the Miamis, as the Filipinos have done under Aguinaldo, chief of the Tagals.

Under date of October 6th, 1789, President Washington forwarded instructions to Governor St. Clair in which he said:

> "It is highly necessary that I should as soon as possible possess full information whether the Wabash and Illinois Indians are most inclined for war or peace. . . . You will therefore inform the said Indians of the dispositions of the General Government on this subject, and of their reasonable desire that there should be a cessation of hostilities as a prelude to a treaty. . . . I would have it observed forcibly, that a war with the Wabash Indians ought to be avoided by all means consistently with the security of the frontier inhabitants, the security of the troops, and the national dignity. . . . But if, after manifesting clearly to the Indians the dispositions of the General Government for the preservation of peace and the extension of a just protection to the said Indians, they should continue their incursions, the United States will be constrained to punish them with severity."

The Indians were most inclined for war, as the Tagals have been, and a good deal of hard fighting, extending over five years, was done before they were brought to terms in a treaty. The battle at Miami Village, September 30th, 1790, between about 1,800 Americans under General Harmar, and a somewhat larger body of Indians, under various chiefs, resulted in a victory for the Indians, with a loss of 120 men killed and 300 wigwams burned. Another pitched battle was fought near the same place the next year. The Indians were again victorious, and the American loss was more than half the army—631 killed and 263 wounded. On August 20th, 1794, General Wayne, with 900 United States soldiers, routed the Indians in a battle near Miami Rapids, and a year later a treaty of peace was concluded, by the terms of which nearly the whole of Ohio was ceded by the Indians to the United States.

It will be observed that with five years of war we had got no farther west that Ohio. And these battles with the Indians in the Miami valley were more bloody than any ever fought by American armies with white men.

This long and bloody Indian war did not end our troubles in the Northwest. The Indians confederated under Tecumseh in 1811, and they were routed at the battle of Tippecanoe, by General Harrison. This practically terminated Indian hostilities in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Northwest Territory, but Tecumseh stirred up resistance among the Creeks and their allies in our new acquisitions south of the Ohio, known as the Southwest Territory. The rebellion there began with the massacre at Fort Mims, on August 30th, 1813, in the Creek Nation, and ended with the battle of Tohopeka, on March 27th, 1814, where the Indians were defeated by troops under General Jackson. About 1,000 Creek warriors were engaged at Tohopeka, and more than half of them (550) were killed. Seven fierce battles were fought during the continuance of this brief war, with an aggregate loss to the Indians of 1,300 killed and an unknown number of wounded.

The Black Hawk war, in 1832, cost the lives of 25 Americans and 150 Indians.

The Florida war began in 1835 and lasted seven years, ending with the final defeat of the Indians.

Since the conclusion of the Florida or Seminole war our armed conflicts with Indians have been mostly in the West, on territory which we acquired by purchase from France and by cession from Mexico in concluding a two years' war with that country.

"Between 1846 and 1866 there were some fifteen or twenty Indian wars or affairs, in which it is estimated that 1,500 whites and 7,000 Indians were killed."

"In the actions between regular troops and Indians, from 1866 to 1891, the number of whites killed was 1,452; wounded, 1,101. The number of Indians killed was 4,363; wounded, 1,135."*

Our Indian wars have been expensive as well as bloody. It is estimated by the War Department that, excluding the time covered by our wars with Great Britain (1812-'14), and with Mexico (1846-'48) and with the Confederate States (1861-'65) three-fourths of the total expense of the army is chargeable, directly or indirectly, to the Indians; the aggregate thus chargeable is put at $807,073,658, and this does not include cost of fortifications, posts and stations: nor does it include amounts reimbursed to the several States ($10,000,000) for their expenses in wars with the Indians. The Indian war pension account in 1897 stood at $28,201,632.

Except when engaged in the other wars, the army has been

*These statistics are gathered from the Census Report on Indians, 1890.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

used almost entirely for the Indian service, and stationed in the Indian country and along the frontier.

Such in general outline is Americanism as it has consistently exhibited itself in the policy followed by this country at the only junctures which are comparable to the Philippine situation at the present day. If it amounts to imperialism, then, indeed, are we a nation of imperialists without division.

But let us get closer to the subject. The case presented by the anti-imperialists against the present Administration is almost exactly paralleled in the history of Florida. Spain's title to the Philippines was as good as that by which she claimed Florida, for it had the same basis—the right of discovery; and her right to cede and convey her title was as perfect in the one case as in the other. In both instances, the inhabitants were, by international law, transferred with the land on which they dwelt.* Filipinos inhabited the Philippine Islands when Magellan discovered them in 1521, and when Villalobos, a few years later, "took possession of the group and named it in honor of King Philip II. of Spain," and they were there in 1898, when Spain ceded the archipelago to the United States, in consideration of closing a war and the payment of $20,000,000 in money.

The Seminole Indians inhabited Florida when that region was discovered by the early Spanish navigators, and they were there in 1819-'21, when Spain ceded the country to the United States in consideration of removing a just cause of war on our part, and a stipulation to settle claims against Spain to the amount of $5,000,000.

The treaty for Florida was concluded in 1819, but was not ratified by Spain till the second year thereafter; a territorial government was established on March 30th, 1822, the President, in the meantime, governing the Territory through the army. Florida remained a Territory twenty years, the State being admitted on March 3d, 1845. During the territorial period the army was needed there most of the time to suppress disorders in which the Indians were almost always mixed; and in 1835, the

*Am. Supreme Court, in the case of the American Insurance Company v. Canter, 1 Peters, 511, referring to the territory held by a conqueror, awaiting the conclusion of a treaty, says:

"If it be ceded by the treaty, the acquisition is confirmed, and the ceded territory becomes a part of the nation to which it is annexed. . . . On such a transfer of territory, the relations of the inhabitants with their former sovereign are dissolved, and new relations are created between them and the government which has acquired their territory. The same act which transfers their country transfers the allegiance of those who remain in it."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war with the Seminoles began. Andrew Jackson was President during the first two years of this war, it continued all through Van Buren's term and extended a year or more into that of Harrison and Tyler. To suppress this rebellion of Osceola and his allies, the army, consisting of regulars, militia and volunteers, was employed seven years.

President McKinley is now doing in the Philippines just what was done by President Jackson and his successors in Florida, and he is doing it more humanely. Were they imperialists?

As to matters of government, Americanism means American rule in American territory. Americans govern by majorities—majorities of those who, by previous constitutional and statutory provisions, are authorized to govern, and whose administration of public affairs has been, as far as practicable, determined in advance by properly constituted authorities.

Beginning with the Pilgrims' compact, we have grown a republic, removing or surmounting all obstacles in the way of our development, until now we are in the forefront of nations. We have liberated the negro and given him the ballot. The Indians, of whom there are about as many in the country as ever, have to their credit in the national treasury a trust fund amounting to about $25,000,000; they are dissolving their tribal relations; the adults, under Government supervision, are learning to work at farming and other useful callings, their children are in Government schools, and all are in process of citizenization. Government Indian schools now number about 150, with nearly as many contract schools. Indian education is costing the Government about $2,000,000 a year.

The course of Americanism has been in the natural order, a little rough sometimes, it is true, but that, too, is in the nature of things. What these people call imperialism is only mirage in the heated air of politics—and it will entirely disappear when the snow flies again.

The trouble in the Philippines has been occasioned by Aguinaldo and his associates. Americans are there of right, and they ask nothing of the natives but to be peaceable, to obey the laws and to go ahead with their business; they will not only be protected in every right, but will be aided by all the powerful influences of an advanced and aggressive civilization.

W. A. Peffer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRITISH STRATEGY IN SOUTH AFRICA.

BY MAJOR-GENERAL O. O. HOWARD, U. S. A. (RETIRED.)

IT was in last December that the writer prepared an article for the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW entitled "An American General's View of the Situation in South Africa." Lord Roberts had just taken command. Having read his book, than which there is none more graphic, clear and straightforward—in the main an autobiography of an eventful army career, chiefly spent in India and its vicinity, and embracing a review of the exciting and terrible Sepoy Rebellion—I was prepared to predict what such a general would be most likely to do.

In general, the plan I had in mind has been carried forward from start to finish, for the campaign is now substantially ended. It has been suggested that it might be interesting to point out the deviations from the original plans, which in Lord Roberts's mind and mine were, evidently, substantially the same, which have occurred in the actual working-out of the details of the campaign.

In order to clear the country of the hostile force of Boers in his immediate front, and so make the line of railway from New London to DeAar safe for the transportation of supplies and troops, Lord Roberts planned to break across the Orange River, somewhere east of the railroad to Kimberley, evidently trusting to that strategic move to accomplish the desired result. This was wise; but, judging from things as they appeared from a distance, I should have sent a detachment as strong as possible, to drive out those commandos of Boers which were in his neighborhood and south of the Orange River. Lord Roberts evidently saw objections to this course—first, probably, the strength of the Boers in mountain fastnesses; second, the extraordinary character of their fighting, with their thorough mastery of modern arms and modern methods. They use open and very irregular lines. They have a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

series of shelters which are practically in echelon with each other. Their marksmen cannot be excelled, and the individual Boer among them selects and prepares and defends his own cover, whether that be a log, a depression in the ground, a rifle-pit or a ledgy rock. Furthermore, the Boer is as brave and as tenacious as the English, Scotch or Irish. Again, he is thoroughly conversant with that peculiar country of kopjes, drifts and craggy mountains, as none of his opponents, until they had had actual experience there, could possibly be. Knowing this, doubtless Roberts was right, in his first movement, in ignoring these fierce occupants of the rough country between Stormberg and the Orange River.

Again, it is asserted that his primary intention was to make Kimberley, should he succeed in taking it, his new base of operations. I think, however, that was not his design, for it would have been too difficult to cover his communications from Cape Colony by Kimberley, for all his purposes.

As we all know, Roberts was eminently successful, beginning at Methuen's camp, in crossing the Riet River and passing between Cronje's besieging force and Bloemfontein.

Again, it was anticipated that the Boers would not wait to be assailed by a large army in flank and rear. Cronje's generalship was shown in his prompt retreat, while that of Roberts and Kitchener was displayed in so speedily enveloping his retreating force at the Modder River. With our maps made on a small scale, we do not realize the long and fatiguing marches which these movements necessitated. Lord Roberts's character and Kitchener's were brought into contrast at the so-called battle of Paardeberg. Kitchener was obliged to act with promptitude, and so ordered an assault which cost him a loss of twelve hundred men in killed and wounded, without securing any positive results. The Field Marshal, Roberts, arrived soon after to show him how better to accomplish a great purpose. It is said that Lord Roberts carefully reconnoitered the position and determined to make no further attacks, but to wait for the surrender that was sure to come. He naturally, however, made such a use of his artillery as would show Cronje the futility of a long delay.

After Cronje's capture, on the 15th of February, Roberts suffered the loss of his convoy of two hundred wagons, containing 500,000 rations. It was guarded by only one company of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

famous Gordon Highlanders—certainly an insufficient protection. This loss was doubtless due to two errors, probably not the Field Marshal's own. One was the leaving of any considerable force near at hand to the right rear of his column of march; and the other arose from that singular contempt for the ability and activity of the enemy on the part of so many subordinate British commanders, which in this case was doubtless responsible for the inadequacy of the guard. Even the Gordon Highlanders do not seem to have learned, like their adversaries, how to skirmish in open, irregular, individually protected lines. A small force of Boers, not exceeding two hundred men, by their unyielding, persistent methods, again and again accomplished vastly more than would be required to protect such a convoy.

In the execution of his plans, Roberts was very fortunate in the selection of his cavalry commander, General French. One writer says that "French covered more than 150 miles of country which was, for the most part, waterless, destitute of food for man or horse, and scorched by a burning sun." In doing this he disabled at least a third of his horses. The first thing he did was to strip his column of all unnecessary luggage; the second, to move so swiftly as to surprise the Boers; the third, to leave a body he was pursuing in a westerly direction, and, without further instruction, to put himself in pursuit of Cronje's main force, moving east, which had gained a night-march on him; and again, with clear-cut generalship, to decline battle with a view of putting his whole force between Cronje and Bloemfontein.

The advance of Roberts's army, now upwards of forty thousand men in three columns, he himself usually being with the centre, reminds one of Sherman's advance against General Johnston in the spring of 1864, all the way from near Chattanooga to Atlanta. In simple orders, both of these commanders named the points to be reached, which in no case appear to have been anticipated by the enemy. Roberts told what had been done, but he did not reveal what he was going to do. The left column, on the 10th of March, had a battle at Abraham's Krall. By this engagement that column was delayed and the other came to its assistance, having already passed the flank of the delaying force. Again and again, our several columns on "the march to the sea" thus helped each other without further instructions, and without substantially interrupting the march. On all direct roads, the Boer command-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers were ready and waiting for Roberts's army, but he carefully effected a wide detour to avoid those bloody direct assaults which the Boers knew so well how to deliver.

On the 14th of March, Lord Roberts had full possession of the Free State capital, Bloemfontein, sending his right wing well out toward Thabanchu, his left wing out and forward toward Boshof, and his straight advance toward Brandfort.

Of course, a reasonable delay then became necessary, because the direct railway to Cape Town had to be put in order, and whatever hostile forces General Botha, the new commander who succeeded General Joubert, might send to his right or rear would have to be looked after. Quite a distance to the southeast there was an important town, Wepener, which was held by one of Roberts's garrisons. The Boer commander undertook to capture that garrison; but Roberts succeeded, as he had done in every battle of any importance, in displacing the beseigers by prompt reinforcement and saving the garrison. The only wonder is that better generalship was not displayed on the part of the Boers at this time. In my prospective contemplation of the campaign, I anticipated that General Joubert would be alive and in active command, but this was not the case. I anticipated that he would draw in the Boers, rapidly making the concentration in the vicinity of Kroonstad. The Vatch River, just south, with its branches, afforded the best practicable line of defense for the Boer commander, but the young general who replaced the veteran Joubert had no such plan; so that when General Roberts, after six weeks of rest, with his communications reasonably clear and his supplies brought up, began his northward march with seventy thousand available men, there was no concentrated force of any considerable strength to oppose him. True, in something of a panic the forces in Natal had been brought back, and those that got away from Kimberley, Mafeking, Stormberg, Wepener and other points were gathered somewhere in front of this advance. But General Botha's attention seems to have been attracted rather to the defense of Johannesburg and Pretoria than to attempting the only thing that could have promised him a reasonable success. Under like circumstances, Stonewall Jackson would have had a main body, pretty well in reserve, well entrenched, and would have sent out a strong mounted force to strike, first one wing, next the centre, and then possibly the other wing of Roberts's force, dealing such blows as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would disconcert any organized movement, and, if possible, draw on a general engagement near the defensive line of Kroonstad. It was something like this sort of defense that I anticipated. General Joseph E. Johnston made it on the Atlanta campaign against Sherman's advance, and with a much smaller army he did the same thing again in the Carolinas, gathering up fragments to deliver against us a last troublesome and confusing attack; but evidently no Boer generalship equal to such operations existed after the death of General Joubert.

Lord Roberts has displayed in his last movement, from the 23d of April up to his entrance into Johannesburg, on the 14th of June, and his taking possession of Pretoria, the capital of the Transvaal, four days later, the same consummate generalship throughout the march and in all the engagements. Never for an instant has he turned aside from the main object of his campaign, which has been to defeat his adversaries with the least possible loss, and to possess himself of the strong, strategic positions which must control the two States. The part played, under Roberts's orders, upon the flanks of the march, by Buller upon the one hand and the relieving force to Mafeking on the other, have been co-ordinate and co-operative with the operations of the central army, and successful. I had anticipated that General Buller would have pushed for the only remaining railroad which passes from Pretoria eastward to Lorenzo Marquez, but his force was not set free soon enough to warrant that. Therefore, a campaign from Pretoria as a new base may be necessitated to finish up the entire work of subjugation. The last report, however, is that Portugal has forbidden the importation into the Transvaal of any more supplies, and these are necessary for carrying on the war for a longer period.

To my mind, a guerilla strife in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State against the English nation, victorious as she now is, would be the height of folly.

The incidents of the South African campaigns and of the battles give evidence that mere brute courage in the fight, or skill in the use of arms, or tenacity in holding important positions, plays but a small part in winning victories, compared with intelligent and able commanding.

Lord Roberts and Joubert not only planned well, but they varied their plans to meet emergencies. Such examples of gen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eralship as those of Roberts and Joubert demonstrate plainly, not only that a professional training for a General is a good thing, but that in great emergencies a large experience, which crowns years of faithful work, is most desirable, and that the possession of a character which will bring to the General the love and confidence of his soldiers is indispensable.

The British nation was fortunate, indeed, in being able to send to South Africa a man so well equipped as Lord Roberts, strong in body and mind, ripe in the long experience of active campaigning, chastened by heavy trials, and so large-hearted as to win the love of his subordinates and the respect of his enemies.

O. O. HOWARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME ABSURDITIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BY T. P. O'CONNOR, M. P.

In one of Anthony Trollope's novels there is a pathetic picture of a great business man who had risen from poverty to wealth; who had transformed the whole face of his country, and enriched all its present and future generations; and yet who had experienced in all these mighty achievements nothing like the thrill of pleasure with which he heard himself referred to in the House of Commons as the "honorable member" for such and such a place.

This picture carries more to the imagination of one acquainted with the House of Commons than it could even to so keen a student of human nature as Mr. Trollope. And, besides, from Mr. Trollope's lack of personal acquaintance with the House, the picture lacked another, and perhaps an even more pathetic, feature. I have seen scores of these wealthy, self-made men enter the House of Commons, all betraying in their look the same consciousness of a triumphant climax to a prosperous career. The vanity has been too transparent to be anything but amusing; a revelation of that ambition for supremacy in wealth and rise in social position, which lies at the root of much of the life of this country. And you forgive all the exultation of those first hours in the House of Commons when you see this same man within a short time afterwards. It may be a few months; it may be a year; but it always comes. You observe that the face has grown downcast; that he who has been seen, as it were, glued to his seat for months, suddenly begins to be less frequent in attendance; or that, if he be in the House at all, he is to be found wandering about the lobbies and corridors, silent, distrait, with a certain suggestion of not belonging to the place, of finding himself a stranger and a nuisance there.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If you inquire into the cause of this change, so rapid and so complete, the successful business man will unburden his soul to you, and confess that he finds the House of Commons a disappointment. He entered with a high sense of its august glory, and of the tremendous part it has played in the history of the Empire and of the world; and, accordingly, he expected that he would find there the climax and the consummation of all those qualities which have made the commercial greatness of his country. Accustomed to great business transactions, to the promptness, rapidity and energy which are characteristic of English business life, he had expected to find the same methods practiced in the Englishman's chief and highest assembly. He finds nothing of the kind. On the contrary, he learns that the great object of the House of Commons is not how to do business, but how not to do it; that it consists of men who, for the most part, unless for a couple of hours each day, avoid the place as if it were infected with the pestilence; and that, of those who remain in the House and take a part in its proceedings, the majority are wearied, disillusioned men, who have lost nerve and hope and the freshness of their energies.

And coming to this conclusion, and finding that what is wanted of him is not the benefit of his vast experience, not his still huge energy, and not his still characteristic promptitude, but that he is expected to "loaf" about the House until the division is called, he becomes unhappy, and longs for the whirr of the familiar machinery, for the quickness and directness and eager employment of every moment in the old place of business; and, at the height of his glory and of his ambition—as is so often the case with human life—he is really at his most miserable moment.

There are many causes for this transformation of our prosperous and successful millionaire; but the one which, I am certain, accounts for it more than anything else, is the hours of the House of Commons. In these hours, I see the unhappy origin of the enervating and disheartening atmosphere of the place, and of many of the other phenomena which make it one of the most unbusinesslike and ineffective legislative instruments in the world.

Let me try to make those outside the House of Commons realize its methods of work. On four days of the week, it meets

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at three o'clock; on one day, Wednesday, it meets at noon. On the four days, it adjourns usually at half-past twelve at night; on Wednesdays, it adjourns at six o'clock. It will at once strike anybody that there is something very foolish in beginning the work of the day at such a late hour as three o'clock. Men of really active minds and temperaments have usually finished their work at that hour. But this is only the beginning of the absurdities of the House of Commons.

The stranger entering the House at three o'clock would see, during the greater part of the session, a sight the meaning of which would be quite obscure to him. The Speaker sits in his chair like a graven image; the benches are practically deserted, as a rule; not a sound disturbs the stillness; you, somehow or other, get the impression of a tomb-like silence and suspension of life. Now and then, it is true, and on some days of the week, you hear a member get up and mumble something to the unlistening and empty benches, and there is another mumble from one of the clerks, and another from the Speaker, and that is all. What this means is that some private business—a small canal bill, or some of the other subjects which, by infinite absurdity, are heaped upon the shoulders of an overworked and overburdened assembly—has been thus decided. But very often there is not even this small modicum of business to be done, and the silence remains unbroken for the half-hour which elapses between the meeting of the House and half-past three; the Speaker remaining like a graven image, and the House deserted and silent.

Thus half an hour of the best time of the House—the time when it is freshest for work—is wasted. At half-past three, questions begin. I regard the power of asking questions as one of the very best features of our Parliamentary system. The questions are often foolish, frequently they are petty; often they touch on subjects which should be given to local assemblies, and rigorously excluded from the House of Commons. But still these questions enable every member, whether articulate or inarticulate, whether wise or unwise, great or small, to bring before the House every possible subject of interest that may be connected with the vast machinery of social life in the Empire; and this period shows the House in its best and most useful aspect—namely, as the Grand Inquest of the Nation.

Apart from this, the question time is the one which members

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Parliament most like. It is the one period of the evening when you may expect interest, excitement, a scene, a portentous, Ministerial announcement. And the consequence is that it is the one period in the evening when you can be certain there will be something like a full attendance in the House. Indeed, I lay stress on this fullness of attendance at this period of the evening to emphasize a point to which I will return shortly.

After question time, if there be a bill of any interest and importance before the House, there come the speeches by the leading men of the House. It is the time which is most favored by the occupants of the front benches. The prospect of these speeches is sufficient to keep the attendance still large. But if it should happen, as very often it does, that the first speakers are men of no particular note, then the House empties after question time. Or if it should happen that the business under discussion is of vast importance, and yet presents no hope of picturesqueness or general interest, the House again empties. For instance, the Navy estimates, the Army estimates, dealing as they do with the defence of the country—one of its supreme interests, and involving expenditure by tens of millions—are always debated in a House that is practically empty. I have seen millions of money voted by a House consisting at most of ten or fifteen members. Indeed, one might almost venture on the paradox, with regard to the House of Commons, that its attendance and its interest are in inverse proportion to the importance of the subjects which it is debating. A small personal squabble between two members will often bring to the House a crowded, excited and interested audience, while the interests of the Empire will leave the House cold and empty.

Indeed, in some respects, the House may be said to be unrepresentative of the mood or interest of the hour among the masses of the nation. A man in the armor of the fifteenth century could not be more unwieldy than the House of Commons is, under the machinery which it has inherited from olden and from very different days. There was a very remarkable illustration of this during the times of depression and anxiety through which the country was passing in the first months of the present war. Outside the House of Commons—nay, in the lobby, which was but a yard from its floor—there was but one subject uppermost in everybody's mind. To attempt to talk of anything but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the war and its fortunes would have been to abuse the patience and even the patriotism of any Englishman. But you passed from the whirring and noisy street, and even from the buzzing lobby, into the House itself, and you would find that body debating an electric or a gas or a railway bill, as though the fortunes of the Empire were of less importance than the price per thousand of the gas consumed by the inhabitants of the southern part of London.

When the main speeches of the evening are delivered, if there be any such speeches, the hour of half-past seven is reached, and then members become restive. If there be any chance of a division, they seek to rush it on by an outburst of turbulence, by trying to shout down every member who attempts to speak. But if that be found impossible, they rush to the lobby, obtain, if they can, a "pair," and then disappear to their homes and their other amusements or occupations. And then begins what is called the "dinner hour."

The public are quite familiar with the term. They can scarcely take up any description of a sitting of the House without finding some phrase to the effect that the speech was listened to by a small audience, as it was the "dinner hour;" or that such and such a member had the misfortune to be driven into the "dinner hour," or so on. But these phrases, suggestive as they are, do not give anything like an adequate idea of what the dinner hour in the House really means. It means that, from half-past seven in the evening till ten or half-past ten, three-fourths—I would not exaggerate if I even said four-fifths—of the members of the House of Commons are absent from the House. The absent members are as far away from the House, indeed, so far as knowing what is going on there is concerned, as if they were suddenly transported to another island. Nor is this all. Of the members who remain, very few are in the House itself. They also, though they cannot go to their homes, or to the theatre, or to the ball, have to dine; and under the overwhelming sense of boredom, and physical and mental depression which their enforced presence in the House involves, they remain as long as they can over the dinner table and in the smoking rooms. The very last thing they would think of is to go back to the House which they have just left and listen to anything that may be going on there. They know that, during that period, it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only the smaller speakers of the House that will take any part in its proceedings. For their convenience, and to spare them the necessity of going into the House without adequate reason, there is, in several apartments of the House, a board on which the names of the speakers, as they rise, are given; and thus, if there be the sudden and unexpected phenomenon of a speech from one of the more important members, the member dining at leisure, or enjoying his cigar, gets due notice and can rush off to the House.

The Speaker, or the Chairman of Committees, takes a short vacation of half an hour during this period, and for that short interval the House is empty and idle. But for the rest of the time, the House goes on with its business. Men make speeches, Ministers push on supply; divisions are taken, members rushing in from their dinners or their cigars, when the electric bells that ring all over the House give them notice that a division is on; and, in short, everything goes on as if the House were really the House, and not merely a miserable remnant of it.

The newspapers continue, as a rule, to give the world outside a false impression of what the House is really like during this period of the evening. In papers like *The Times,* which still give lengthy reports, columns regularly and duly appear of the speeches that are made; and the public, reading these miles of reports, conjure up before their imaginations an excited and crowded assembly, that sits listening to words which must be wise because they are so fully reported. What occurs, as a matter of fact, is that for some hours every night there are but ten members in the House. Sometimes there are even fewer than the ten. I have seen a member addressing the House when there were but two others in the chamber in addition to himself. I have seen a member address the House when his only audience was the Speaker. Indeed, for some little time before and after the return of the Speaker or the Chairman from his half-hour's recess every night, there are rarely more than half a dozen members in the House.

It is an entire abuse of terms and confusion of ideas to speak of the House of Commons as really sitting and really existing under such circumstances. Of course, Ministers do not urge a reform. The smaller the audience, the more quickly they calculate they will get through their business, and to get through

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business quickly becomes in the end the main ambition of most Ministers. For, like all spendthrifts, the House of Commons, which plays fast and loose with its time and resources, is always in arrears. With all the changes that have been made in the rules, there is the old block of business; now, as in the days of John Bright, you might as well try to pass ten busses through Temple Bar, as try to get business transacted with any rapidity in the House of Commons. But to take the trouble of electing those who ought to be the best and wisest men to a deliberative assembly, and then to constitute that assembly so that, during a fourth or a third of its hours, it shall be deprived of the attendance of these picked men, seems about as absurd an arrangement as the folly of man could devise.

I doubt if even Ministers will long continue to tolerate this state of things. It is harder upon them than upon any other body of members. Whatever happens, they have to remain in the House; they are the one section that can never afford to take even a brief holiday; a night out for them is as much a luxury and a rarity as for a domestic servant. There are some thirty-six to forty officials in the House of Commons. Forty members form the quorum, and thus it comes that, as these officials are in the receipt of salaries from the country, and as they just about form a quorum, they are expected to remain in the House throughout the entire evening. It is not that they are required to take part in debate; as a matter of fact, big and full-dress debates, with all the Ministers present, are almost things of the past. More and more every day it is becoming the custom of the House of Commons to leave a bill exclusively in the charge of one Minister. Whenever a Minister, indeed, intervenes during the debate on the bill of which his colleague is in charge, there is evidently the feeling that this Minister is guilty of an intrusion and almost an impertinence. During the nights, for instance, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer was dealing with the Budget in Committee, the Chancellor sat on the treasury bench all alone. Not even the Secretary of the Treasury was there to keep him in countenance, or even to help him with some of the facts of the department to which they both belong. And, similarly, when the Telephone Bill was being carried through the House of Commons, Mr. Hanbury, the Secretary of the Treasury, was left all to himself; the Chancellor of the Exchequer rarely, if ever, put

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in an appearance. Solidarity, in the sense of a body of men ready and present to help each other in debate, no longer exists in the House of Commons.

This means that the Ministers who don't happen to be in charge of a bill remain outside the House. For some portion of the evening they imitate the ordinary member by sitting in the dining-room. After that they disappear, Heaven knows where. Up to a few years ago, the House of Commons had not apartments for most of the Ministers, and they either had to go back to their offices to work, or try to work in the library. Of recent years they are more favored. A certain number of apartments have been given over to them; but here again the absurd and unpractical spirit which rules over the House of Commons asserts itself. The Ministers are either in small cellars or small attics; either ten feet above the level of the Thames or in some inaccessible room which can only be reached by climbing long staircases.

And thus it happens that the Ministers have to spend nine hours nearly every night in the stifling and enervating atmosphere of the House of Commons. What does this mean? It means that the best energies and the best hours of the men who rule this Empire are, to a large extent, wasted and frittered away. Ministers are constantly breaking down under the strain, the more exasperating because it is so needless. At the beginning of the present session of Parliament, Mr. Wyndham, who was the second figure in the great department on whose energy, activity and skill the fortunes of the Empire depended, had to spend nine hours in the House every night for weeks. Sometimes he had scarcely the time even to snatch, or rather bolt, a meal. And this man was expected after that to be in Pall Mall in the morning, and to come there with all the freshness of his energies, all the clearness of his mind, all the steadiness of his nerves. He broke down, of course, after a while, and was confined to his house for days. In short, if in this hour of national stock taking, or perhaps I should call it national examination of conscience, Great Britain does not pay heed to the waste of time, of health, of careers, of efficiency which takes place in the House of Commons, it will fail to extirpate one of the causes that are devouring the best energies of the rulers of the Empire.

T. P. O'Connor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PART OF THE PEOPLE AND OF THE STATES IN CHOOSING THE PRESIDENT.

BY WALTER L. HAWLEY.

A VERY large majority of the voters in this country believe that they have a constitutional right to help to elect Presidents of the United States by casting their ballots for electors who must obey their order as expressed at the polls. The fact is that the men who made the Constitution of the country evidently did not contemplate the election of Presidents by the people.

The letter of the Constitution makes the State the political unit in national elections, and it was not until 1880, ninety-one years after the election of the first President, that a full and free expression of the choice of the people of all the States of the Union for Chief Executive was recorded at the polls and carried into effect. The result of the popular vote of 1876 was set aside by an Electoral Commission, an act without constitutional authority.

The second section of Article II. of the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

> "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of the Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

If the framers of the Constitution had intended that these electors should be elected by the people, they might have used the word "elect" in this section instead of "appoint." The men who go through the legal form of electing a President and Vice-President were for many years selected by the Legislatures in a number of States, and in South Carolina the custom was not discontinued until the Civil War. There was no record of a popular vote for President until 1824, and that year, in eight

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the twenty-four States then voting, electors were chosen by the Legislatures.

That the evident intention of the makers of the Constitution was to have Presidents elected by the States acting as political units, rather than by vote of the people, is apparent in the constitutional provision for an election when the vote in the Electoral College is a tie. In that event, the election of a President devolves upon the House of Representatives, each State having one vote; and the Senate, voting separately, elects the Vice-President, the votes of a majority of States constituting an election.

The political possibilities of this constitutional provision seem to prove that the election of Presidents by the people is merely a popular custom, permitted, but not ordered, by the fundamental law of the country. If the Electoral College of 1900 or any subsequent year should fail to elect a President and Vice-President, the election would be thrown into the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and the following political possibility would be presented: One political party might have a majority of Representatives in Congress, yet have a minority representation from more than half the States. In that event, the minority party in the House of Representatives would elect the President, because the votes of South Carolina and Florida would count as much as those of New York and Pennsylvania. The same condition might exist in the Senate, and States represented by one Republican and one Democratic Senator might lose their vote in the selection of a Vice-President, if the two Senators failed to agree upon a candidate.

Under existing political conditions, it is an easy matter for one party to elect only a minority of the Representatives from more than half the States, and yet have a majority of the whole number in the House. In 1898, the State of Mississippi elected seven members of Congress, all of one political party, yet the total vote for all candidates in the seven districts was approximately 27,000; while in the Fourteenth District in the State of New York the successful candidate received 31,399 votes, and the defeated candidate 25,083. In the one New York district, the candidates of the two leading parties received more than twice as many votes as were cast for Congressmen in the State of Mississippi. There are thirty-four Congressional Districts in New York; yet, in the event of the election of a President by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House of Representatives, the smaller State would be as powerful as the larger, and in the Electoral College Mississippi has nine votes, one-fourth the number of the Empire State. The terms "popular vote" and "majority rule" seem to be misnomers in a political situation where it is possible, in the election of a President, for 27,000 votes to offset 1,200,000. So the individual voter may well hesitate about proclaimng himself a sovereign in a national election.

Apart from the constitutional provision for an Electoral College and the method of counting the votes cast by the members of that body, our method of electing Presidents is one of political custom and precedent, having for all practical purposes the force of law. Very few of our Presidents have received a majority of all the votes cast by the people, and some of those who received the largest majorities of the electoral vote carried just one more than half of the States of the Union. In 1898, McKinley had a majority over all of more than a quarter of a million in the popular vote, a plurality over Bryan of 600,000, a majority of 95 in the Electoral College, and yet he carried only twenty-three of the forty-five States. The triumph of Cleveland in 1892 was classed as a political landslide; but with his large popular and electoral vote he carried only twenty-three States.

In the Electoral College of 1900, there will be 447 votes, and 224 will be necessary to a choice. If one of the candidates for President received the electoral votes of the twelve States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas and Georgia, he would have 230 in the College, six more than would be necessary to elect. The other candidate might carry the thirty-three States remaining, and be seven votes short of the number requisite to make him President. The twelve States in this list elect 206 of the 357 members of the House of Representatives, a majority of fifty-five. On ordinary political divisions, the party carrying a State for its electoral ticket would elect a majority of the Congressmen from that State. Therefore, in the event of the failure of the Electoral College to elect a President, the party carrying a majority of the States, including all the small ones, would control the election in the House of Representatives, and elect the candidate who had polled a minority of the popular vote.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no law, save the binding force of custom and party loyalty, to compel a Presidential elector to cast his vote for the candidate of his own party, and no constitutional or statutory provisions for going behind the returns of the Electoral College, no matter what the popular vote might be.

Prior to 1800 candidates for President and Vice-President were not nominated by conventions or any other method; a majority of the electors were selected by State Legislatures, and as a rule they were left free to vote for any man regarded as a leader of the party to which they belonged. Beginning in 1800, the members of Congress representing the two political parties nominated candidates for President and Vice-President in caucus, the Constitution having been amended to provide for separate voting for each in the Electoral College.

This system was continued until 1820, when it was abandoned because there was no opposition to the re-election of President Monroe. In that year the popular interest in voting for President, even indirectly, seems to have reached a low ebb, because in nine of the twenty-three States electors were chosen by the Legislatures. The States so acting were Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, New York, South Carolina and Vermont. In 1824 an attempt to revive nominations by caucus of Congressmen failed, and four candidates were voted for in the Electoral College. Jackson received 99 electoral votes, Adams 84, Crawford 41, and Clay 37. There was no election for President, although the Electoral College elected John C. Calhoun Vice-President. In eight States the electors were chosen by the Legislatures, and the popular vote in the other States as recorded was, Jackson, 155,872; Adams, 105,321; Crawford, 44,282, and Clay, 46,587. Jackson, the leading candidate of the Democrats, had a plurality of both the popular and electoral vote, but, for the second time in the history of the Republic, the election of a President was thrown into the House of Representatives. The Democrats were in a majority in both houses of Congress at the time; but each State had only one vote, and thirteen of the twenty-four States voted for John Quincy Adams. Seven States voted for Jackson, and four for Crawford. That election established the fact that, under our Constitution, it is possible for a minority party to elect a President of the Republic, when the election goes to the House of Representatives.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the results of the election of 1824 was to arouse popular interest in national contests; and, four years later, Presidential Electors were appointed by the Legislatures in only three States—Delaware, New York and South Carolina. In 1828, for the first and last time, party candidates for President and Vice-President were nominated by party caucuses in the Legislatures of the States. The total popular vote recorded in 1828, in twenty-one of the twenty-four States, was 1,156,328, an increase of more than 80,000 over the vote of 1824, showing that the voters of the country had become aroused to the possibility of defeating the will of the majority, by throwing the election of a President into the House of Representatives.

The political parties began effective organization by States and counties during President Jackson's first term, but the agitation against the Masonic order was responsible for the first national political convention held in this country to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President. The Anti-Masonic party, as the agitators called themselves, held a convention in Baltimore on September 26th, 1831, and nominated William Wirt, of Maryland, for President, and Amos Ellmaker, of Pennsylvania, for Vice-President. The National Republican, or Whig, party followed with a convention, also held in Baltimore, on December 12th, 1831, and nominated Henry Clay for President.

The first Democratic National Convention met in Baltimore on March 22d, 1832, and renominated Andrew Jackson for President, and nominated Martin Van Buren for Vice-President. That convention adopted the first national political platform, which was in the form of three resolutions declaring the party in favor of protection for American industries, internal improvements at the expense of the general government, and a civil service in Federal employment. Electors were elected by vote of the people that year in every State except South Carolina, but the comparatively new political privilege was not extensively exercised. The total recorded vote for President was less than 100,000 in excess of the vote of 1828, although New York and Delaware were added to the list of States selecting their electors by ballot. The popular vote for William Wirt, the Anti-Masonic candidate, was so small that no official record of it remains, although he received seven votes in the Electoral College

The Whig party held no convention in 1836, but through State

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organizations, conventions and mass meetings nominated three candidates for President and three for Vice-President. The number of States had increased to twenty-six; and all of them, except South Carolina, elected members of the Electoral College by ballot. The total popular vote recorded slightly exceeded 1,500,000, of which Van Buren (Democrat) received 761,549, and W. H. Harrison (Whig) 736,656. In the Electoral College the former had 170 votes to 73 for Harrison.

National conventions, party nominations and direct vote for Electors had become the established rule by 1840, and the Tippecanoe campaign of that year did more than any previous event to arouse the interest of the voters in candidates and general issues. The popular vote went up at a bound, nearly 2,500,000 ballots being counted, with South Carolina alone clinging to the old system of Legislature electing Presidential Electors. While the plurality of Harrison over Van Buren at the polls was less than 150,000, he had 234 votes in the Electoral College to 60 for his opponent. Four years later, the increase in the popular vote was trifling, the total number of ballots recorded being less than 2,700,000. This vote did not pass the three-million mark in 1848, although four new States had been added to the Union and there were three regular candidates for President. The Free Soil party polled 291,263 votes for Martin Van Buren, but failed to carry a State or capture an electoral vote. In 1852, less than 3,200,000 votes were recorded, with thirty-one States in the Union. With a plurality of 214,000 in the popular vote, Franklin Pierce received 254 of the 296 electoral votes.

The popular vote in 1856 exceeded 4,000,000, and Buchanan's plurality over Fremont was nearly half a million, but he was in a minority of nearly 400,000 of the total number of votes cast. In the election of 1860, Lincoln received 1,865,913 votes to 2,814,968 cast for his opponents, but he had 180 votes in the Electoral College to 123 cast for Breckinridge, Bell and Douglas. The Legislature of South Carolina elected the Presidential Electors from that State for the last time, and with that election the old plan disappeared from the political system of the country.

Because of the conditions that prevailed in the South in 1868 and 1872, the popular vote of those years cannot be accepted as fully expressing the political views of all the voters of the Union. The vote of 1876 for Presidential Electors was, therefore, the first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time in the history of the country that the voters of every State, without the intervention of a Legislature, and free of military control or intimidation, cast their ballots for electors, and in that way expressed directly their choice for Chief Magistrate of the Nation. The recorded vote was 4,284,757 for Samuel J. Tilden, and 4,127,848 for all other candidates. Although Tilden had a majority over all on the face of the returns, the vote was set aside in three States, he was counted out by the Electoral Commission, and, as a matter of technical accuracy, it was not until 1880 that the voters of all the States expressed directly at the polls their choice for President and that their decision prevailed. After ninety-one years of effort to overcome legally the evident intent of the Constitution, and to bring about the election of Presidents by a system closely approaching a direct vote of the people, the first President so elected, James A. Garfield, was 300,000 votes short of a majority over all, the moral of which may be that, in republics, majorities do not always rule.

The love of system and order that is one of the dominant traits of the Anglo-Saxon is in a large measure the sustaining force of the Republic, but in even greater degree it has created an unwritten law of custom that compels the election of Presidents in an orderly way, that permits a reasonably fair expression of the wishes of the people. As a matter of written law, Presidential Electors, when they have received their certificate of election, are free to vote for their personal choice for President and Vice-President. That they do vote for the nominees of their respective parties is merely a matter of personal honor and party loyalty. In the early days of the Republic, when party lines were loosely drawn and there were no nominating conventions, Electors did sometimes vote for men who were not the accepted candidates of their party, but never in numbers sufficient to change the anticipated result in the Electoral College.

From the days when the voters were divided into organized political parties, and candidates and Electors were nominated by conventions, there is no record of an Elector having betrayed the trust reposed in him. In the event of a close election, however, the Electors of one State might easily change the result of the popular ballot, and the Constitution and laws of the country provide no legal method by which such a breach of party loyalty could be set aside. The man receiving a majority of the votes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Electoral College, if they are cast and recorded as prescribed by the Constitution, is the legally elected President of the Union, even if two-thirds of all the voters in the country had cast their ballots for another candidate.

The present system of electing a President has never been defended as perfect, or entirely satisfactory to the people; but in practice it has worked so well that changes are rarely suggested, and it is not probable that a new plan will be tried until political corruption has invaded the Electoral College and the action of the voters has been set aside by unfair and illegal methods. The unwritten law of custom is apparently stronger than the Constitution in our system of government, or at least in our plan of electing Presidents. The members of the Electoral College have never failed to obey the mandate of their party; but the recorded will of the voters and the College itself were set aside in 1876, yet peace prevailed and government by the people survived.

WALTER L. HAWLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS BY DIRECT POPULAR VOTE.

BY JOHN HANDIBOE.

ONE of the most interesting problems which have confronted the American political student during the past twenty years is: Shall the President of the United States be elected by direct popular vote? Custom and tradition, the arch-enemies of reform, oppose the innovation, and deceive the public mind with the error-preserving assertion that "what was good enough for our fathers is good enough for us." Few things that were good enough for our fathers are now worthy to remain in actual use; for, as evolution, like revolution, never goes backward, few things capable of improvement have remained unimproved. With everything else of practical utility bettered, with everything which time and usage have shown to be unsuited to present conditions and needs satisfactorily adjusted to them, it must be that the political and governmental regulations which arose out of the necessity of the past will be remedied in so far as they fail to meet in the best way the exigencies of to-day. There must be improvement in political relations, as well as scientific or mechanical affairs, or men cannot derive from the general advancement all the benefit they have a right to expect.

It is the purpose of this article to show that, though there has been improvement, in the past century, in the method of selecting Presidential nominees and in electing candidates, the improvement stopped short of its logical goal; and to illustrate the inequalities and crudities of the law as it has come down to us.

The men who framed the Constitution, while wise in many things pertaining to government and political relations, knew nothing about the election of a President, and were at a loss to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

determine how that should be done. It was at first suggested that an executive of three men should be established, one from the East, one from the Middle States, and one from the South, as it was feared a single executive could not care properly for the interests of a section of the country to which he was a stranger. After considerable debate, a single executive was decided upon; and then came the question of how he was to be elected. It was agreed that he should not be elected by popular choice, because, the Constitution-makers believed, the country was "too large," and the people were "too ignorant" to be entrusted with such an important business; and it was feared that with the growth of the country a time would come when there would be no man of reputation sufficiently national to make him a desirable nominee, so that the people would be unable to agree upon any man for the office. It was decided that Congress should elect the President, who should serve for seven years and be ineligible for re-election. This plan, however, was not well received by the leading spirits of the country, because Congress had the power both of election and impeachment, and it was feared the President would become its creature. The arguments against the plan had weight with the makers of the Constitution. They, therefore, rescinded that method and substituted another, which fixed the Presidential term at four years and made the executive eligible to re-election. But the idea of popular elections was still repugnant; and, to prevent these, and still keep Presidential elections out of the control of Congress, in obedience to public demand, the idea of choice by Electors was evolved and adopted.

The States were empowered to appoint Electors, as the Legislature of each State should direct; and the Legislatures of the several States, therefore, appointed Electors. These Electors were clothed with sole power to select a fit man for Presidential candidate and to vote for him, the Electors of each State voting independently, without regard to the candidates or the vote of the electors of other States. The Electors of all the States voted on the same day, however, each Electoral body in its own State, the design in this being to prevent the Electors of all States coming together under practically the same influences that now control national conventions. Each Elector was master of his own actions in the choice of the Presidential candidate, and thus was relieved from the control of Congress or of political parties. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was the law of Presidential selection and election as first definitely adopted.

But, while this law was intended to be definite, it could not be permanent. It did not give satisfaction long, the election of 1796 proving that it was possible to elect the President from one party and the Vice-President from another; and, as a consequence, though the fathers intended that no electoral vote should be pledged, and that the Electors alone should select a President, in 1800 the Republican members of Congress held a caucus for the nomination of Presidential candidates to be voted for by all Republican Electors. Jefferson and Burr being chosen, every Republican Elector voted for these candidates. The Electors were thus deprived of the power with which they had been originally clothed, and they have never recovered it. This was the first change toward popular control of Presidential elections and the conversion of State Electoral Boards into mere representatives of State pluralities.

The next change in the original plan of elections was made in 1804, when the Electors were empowered to cast two ballots, one for President and one for Vice-President. Prior to this time, one ballot, containing the names of two candidates, had been cast, the candidate receiving the greater number of votes being declared President and the other Vice-President. In this year, also, the Congressional caucus became a fixture; and, until 1824, all Presidential candidates were nominated by such caucus. In 1824, the people obtaining full control of State and local government, the State legislatures and State conventions began to make nominations, depriving the Congressional caucus of its power. At this time, also, the people began to select Electors by ballot. The new method of nominating did not give entire satisfaction, and the meeting of Protectionists in Harrisburg, in 1827, and of Anti-Masons in Baltimore, in 1831, paved the way to the popular national convention with such success that, in 1832, the Democrats and National Republicans adopted the national caucus for the nomination of candidates. The caucus, however, was a crude instrument and fell into disuse. In 1840, the national convention, nearly as we now know it, was created, and all Presidents elected since that time have been nominated by national conventions of the nominating parties.

We have seen, therefore, these successive methods of the selec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and election of Presidential candidates—the untrammelled selection and election of candidates by the separate boards or "colleges" of Electors, appointed by State Legislatures, acting independently, each Elector voting for two candidates for President; the selection of candidates by Congressional caucus and election by appointed Electors; balloting separately for President and Vice-President; selection of Electors by popular vote; nomination of candidates by State conventions and Legislatures; nomination by national caucus; nomination by national convention. Thus, the whole intention of the framers of the Constitution has been swept away, with the sole purpose of giving the people fuller control of Presidential elections. There is no sanctity of tradition nor reverence of custom binding the people of to-day to the error of a century; especially since the people of former years corrected the error according to their lights, but corrected it only in part. Each change in the law as originally enforced fortifies the people of to-day in the earnest endeavor to make Presidential elections really popular, and tends to remove the feeling of many good citizens that to change this particular law would be almost treason. The evolution toward a really popular government has stopped at its most important stage.

It is worth while to consider some of the inequalities and crudities of the present law. Some time ago, in an article in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, Bishop Merrill pointed out one of the greatest of these. This is, in substance, that the individual inhabitant of a State having thirty-six Electors exercises, in the choice of a President, twelve times the power of the individual voter residing in a State having only three Electors. In the one State each voter casts a ballot for thirty-six Electors; and, if his one vote decide the election, he will have won for his party twelve times as many Electors as the individual voter deciding the election in the other State could possibly win for his party. The illustration applies with the same force to one hundred voters, or to one thousand, as to one. Indeed, the Bishop could have gone further, and said that a hundred voters in New York could overthrow the electoral votes of ten States, without regard to the popular pluralities of those States. In fact, in 1884, six hundred votes taken from the Democratic candidate and given to the Republican would have put New York in the Republican column. It may, then, be said that six hundred voters in New York gave

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that State to Cleveland. These six hundred votes outbalanced the electoral votes of eight States, with pluralities aggregating 110,000, and an electoral vote of 33. These States were: Colorado, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont. The fact is thus demonstrated that, in each State, the individual voter's elective power is augmented or curtailed by a law which does not recognize the individual as a potential factor in a national election.

To remedy this inequality, the Bishop suggests that Presidential Electors be voted for separately by Congressional districts, instead of by a State ballot; each Elector being chosen by the Congressional district in which he resides, irrespective of the candidacy or the political fortunes of other Electors in his State. On the surface this seems to promise the needed corrective; but in fact it falls short of the necessities. It would, it is true, give each Congressional district an Elector of its political suasion, and elect a President of the same political faith as the lower house of the Congress going into office with him. But, although this would be a real and appreciable step in the direction of a reform the need of which the framers of the Constitution could not have foreseen, it does not go far enough. It promises to remove inequalities and leave the citizen untrammelled in the selection of a President, making one man's vote as valuable and as determinative as the vote of any other man anywhere. But this work it cannot perform, for it cannot reach and destroy the gerrymander. In nearly, if not quite, every State in which the dominant political party has had the opportunity, the Congressional districts have been so arranged and manipulated that a small plurality of the State vote may be made to yield a large majority of Congressmen. The gerrymander is, in this way, a pattern and an annoying imitation of the electoral system. Bishop Merrill's plan, were it adopted, would be manifestly unable to change this, and, therefore, unable to remove inequalities or correct crudities in Presidential elections.

A study of the figures of Presidential elections shows that the successful candidate gets an electoral vote for a smaller number of popular votes than his defeated opponent; and that, in his majorities, the successful nominee gets an electoral vote for a ridiculously small number of popular ballots. It has been declared with more or less vehemence, but with a great deal of sophistry, that "what is good for one is good for another" in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

choosing of electoral boards. The truth is that what is bad for one is bad for the whole country, in that what can be improved and is not may often become the instrument of defeating the will of the people, and in a popular government it is difficult to conceive of a more sinister occurrence. The following table will illustrate how the electoral system sets the popular will at defiance and has defeated it:

CANDIDATES.	Popular vote.	Electoral vote.	Chief vote.	Ratio of electoral to popular plurality.	Popular plurality.	Total popular vote.	Electoral majority to pop. plurality.	Electoral majority.
1828—								
Jackson	647,231	178			138,134			
Adams	509,097	83					95	1,453
1832—								
Jackson	687,502	219			157,313		170	523
Clay	530,189	49			10,820			
1840—								
Harrison	1,275,017	234			146,816		174	841
Van Buren	1,128,702	60			10,811			
1844—								
Polk	1,337,243	170			38,175		65	387
Clay	1,299,068	105			12,372			
1848—								
Taylor	1,360,101	163			8,344		36	2,876
Cass	1,220,544	127			9,610			
1852—								
Pierce	1,601,474	254			6,305		220,896	212	4,047
Scott	1,380,576	143			32,106			
1856—								
Buchanan	1,838,169	174			10,564		496,905	69	8,284
Fremont	1,341,264	114			11,763			
1860—								
Lincoln	1,866,352	180			10,368		491,195	368	2,924
Douglas	1,375,157	12					144,596		
Breckinridge	845,736	72			11,746				
Bell	589,581	39			15,117				
1864—									
Lincoln	2,216,167	212			407,453		405,249	191	2,192
McClellan	1,808,725	21			36,129				
1868—									
Grant	3,015,071	214			23,435		305,456	134	2,279
Seymour	2,709,615	80			23,670				
1872—									
Grant	3,597,070	286			762,077		762,077	423	8,420
Greeley	2,834,079	63			44,985				
1876—									
Garfield	4,449,053	214			20,790		7,018	69	119
Hancock	4,442,035	155			21,456				
1884—									
Cleveland	4,911,017	219			23,142		62,683	67	694
Blaine	4,848,334	182			26,639				
1888—									
Harrison	5,440,216	233			23,348		*	65	*
Cleveland	5,540,329	168			94,923				
1892—									
Cleveland	5,556,918	277			380,810		380,810	122	3,122
Harrison	5,176,108	145			35,697				
1896—									
McKinley	7,101,401	271			26,204		630,745	95	6,639
Bryan	6,470,656	176			36,135				

The table begins with the vote of 1828, because there were no real elections by the people until 1824; and, as no candidate had a popular majority in that year, the House of Representatives

*Harrison did not have a popular plurality.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elected the President. In 1836, four Whigs ran against Van Buren, who won; the vote of the Whig party being thus dissipated, the election of that year is not included in the table. In 1860, Lincoln's closest competitor for the popular vote was Douglass; and Lincoln's popular and electoral votes are therefore compared with his. If, however, the reader be dissatisfied with this treatment of that election, the figures will show to him that Lincoln had a minority of 944,122 in the popular vote, and yet received 57 more electoral votes than all his opponents received. The figures for 1876 are omitted because, owing to the manner in which the election of that year was decided, they can be of no value here.

The table proclaims the failure of the electoral "college" system to give a method of electing the chief executive which can be depended upon to be fair and equitable at all times and under all circumstances. The case of Douglass, as illustrating its inequality, is an extreme one, it must be admitted, but one which, being recorded, is not beyond the possibility of repetition. That such a poor return of Electors for votes cast was shown to be possible should have been sufficient reason for a thorough change and improvement of election laws. But the significance of the result that year was unheeded; and, as a consequence, it was found possible, in 1876, by slight changes in the popular vote, to give an electoral majority to a candidate who even then was without a popular plurality. This was followed by the total collapse of the popular will and electoral "college" theory in 1888, when Cleveland, with a popular plurality of 98,017, was defeated by an electoral majority of 65. To sum it up: In every election the winning candidate receives more electors in proportion to his popular vote than the unsuccessful candidate; in every case, the proportion of popular votes necessary to win his excess of electoral votes is very small, and in every case the popular will, as represented by the popular vote, is enfeebled or wholly repudiated by the electoral choice. Here are the greatest inequalities of the present system, emphasizing its incompatibility with popular election of Presidents. For instance, how is it possible to harmonize the theory of equitable election laws, and the older theory of equal representation, with the fact that, in the contest of 1852, Pierce received one electoral vote for every 6,305 of popular votes, while for every 32,106 popular votes Scott got only one electoral vote? Or what more aptly illustrates the absurdity of the present system

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than the election of 1860, when Lincoln received one electoral vote for each 10,368 popular votes, and Douglass got only one elector for every 114,596 votes?

It is apparent that the people are inclined to diminish the power of Electors, as shown in alterations in the conduct of elections; that the tendency of these alterations is toward a fuller exercise of individual rights by the people; that the present system, denuded though it be of some of its objectionable original garb, is still unsatisfactory; that it does not give the people the full enjoyment of suffrage which of right is theirs; that candidates as well as people are not equally represented in the electoral college, or are, because of the unfairness of the law, deprived of what, under a fair law, would be a victory. For such evils a remedy can be found only in an amendment of the Constitution which will do away with the electoral "college" and substitute for it a definite election by popular ballot. In no other way can there really be a government of the people, by the people, for the people. The popular ballot, untrammelled and unperverted by present Constitutional restrictions, will insure the election of the candidate receiving the highest number of votes. It will remove all the inequalities now complained of, but endured apathetically, and make the vote of the citizen of one State as potent as that of the citizen of another. It will make the most ingenious gerrymander powerless to affect the result. It will put the citizens of the small State on exactly the same footing as the citizens of the large State, without detriment to the interests of either. It will make the repetition of the returning-board episode unnecessary and impossible, and will prevent the election of a President by Congress, thus doubly assuring popular choice. It will check corruption, discourage vote buying, the concentration of vast sums of money for use in carrying certain desired States, put an end to colonizing for the same purpose, and to a great extent weaken, if not destroy, the vast system of blackmail now conducted under the name of campaign-fund contributions. Without a direct popular vote for President, a "government by the people" is somewhat mythical; with it we shall have a real republic.

JOHN HANDIBOE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED